

First District



Gloria Molina

Second District



Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

Third District



Zev Yaroslavsky

Fourth District



Don Knabe

Fifth District



Michael D. Antonovich



Adobe Acrobat Reader 5.0

Finding Words

You can use the Find command to find a complete word or part of a word in the current PDF document. Acrobat Reader looks for the word by reading every word on every page in the file, including text in form fields.

To find a word using the Find command:

- 1. Click the Find button (**Binoculars**), or choose Edit > Find.
- 2. Enter the text to find in the text box.
- 3. Select search options if necessary:
 - Match Whole Word Only finds only occurrences of the complete word you enter in the box. For example, if you search for the word *stick*, the words *tick* and *sticky* will not be highlighted.
 - Match Case finds only words that contain exactly the same capitalization you enter in the box
 - Find Backwards starts the search from the current page and goes backwards through the document.
- 4. Click Find. Acrobat Reader finds the next occurrence of the word.

To find the next occurrence of the word:

Do one of the following:

Choose Edit > Find Again

Reopen the find dialog box, and click Find Again. (The word must already be in the Find text box.)

Copying and pasting text and graphics to another application

You can select text or a graphic in a PDF document, copy it to the Clipboard, and paste it into another application such as a word processor. You can also paste text into a PDF document note or into a bookmark. Once the selected text or graphic is on the Clipboard, you can switch to another application and paste it into another document.

Note: If a font copied from a PDF document is not available on the system displaying the copied text, the font cannot be preserved. A default font is substituted.

To select and copy it to the clipboard:

1. Select the text tool T, and do one of the following:

To select a line of text, select the first letter of the sentence or phrase and drag to the last letter.

To select multiple columns of text (horizontally), hold down Ctrl+Alt (Windows) or Option (Mac OS) as you drag across the width of the document.



To select a column of text (vertically), Hold down Ctrl+Alt (Windows) or Option+Command (Mac OS) as you drag the length of the document.

To select all the text on the page, choose Edit > Select All. In single page mode, all the text on the current page is selected. In Continuous or Continuous – facing mode, most of the text in the document is selected. When you release the mouse button, the selected text is highlighted. To deselect the text and start over, click anywhere outside the selected text. The Select All command will not select all the text in the document. A workaround for this (Windows) is to use the Edit > Copy command.

- 2. Choose Edit > Copy to copy the selected text to the clipboard.
- 3. To view the text, choose Window > Show Clipboard
 In Windows 95, the Clipboard Viewer is not installed by default and you cannot use the
 Show Clipboard command until it is installed. To install the Clipboard Viewer, Choose
 Start > Settings > Control Panel > Add/Remove Programs, and then click the Windows
 Setup tab. Double-click Accessories, check Clipboard Viewer, and click OK.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY, THE MEETING WILL PLEASE COME TO
- 2 ORDER. THIS IS THE SPECIAL MEETING FOR THE BUDGET
- 3 DELIBERATIONS. SECRETARY, CALL THE ROLL.

4

5 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA?

6

7 SUP. MOLINA: HERE.

8

9 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY?

10

11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: HERE.

12

13 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** SUPERVISOR KNABE?

14

15 **SUP. KNABE:** HERE.

16

17 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH?

18

19 SUP. ANTONOVICH: HERE.

20

21 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** AND SUPERVISOR BURKE.

22

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HERE.

24

25 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: WE HAVE A QUORUM.**



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: LET ME SAY HOW I PROPOSE TO GO FORWARD. I
- 2 KNOW THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE HERE ON ITEMS, BUT WE HAD HEARINGS
- 3 ON ALL OF THOSE ITEMS, SO THIS -- AT THIS POINT, THESE ARE
- 4 DELIBERATIONS. THIS IS NOT A HEARING. AT THE END OF OUR
- 5 MEETING, AFTER WE'VE CONCLUDED OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE WILL HAVE
- 6 TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO WISH TO MAKE
- 7 PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT AT THIS POINT, THE WAY I PROPOSE TO GO AS
- 8 ACCORDING TO THE AGENDA, FIRST THE C.A.O. WILL MAKE HIS
- 9 PRESENTATION, THEN WE WILL GO STRAIGHT DOWN THE AGENDA. IN
- 10 CALLING FOR MOTIONS IT'S MY INTENTION TO START WITH THE FIRST
- 11 DISTRICT AND TO GO STRAIGHT DOWN SO THAT EACH MEMBER HAS AN
- 12 OPPORTUNITY TO LIST ANY MOTIONS THAT THEY HAVE. THE MOTIONS
- 13 THAT RECEIVE A SECOND, WE WILL KEEP TRACK OF AND THEN WE'LL
- 14 COME AT THE CONCLUSION, AFTER EVERYONE SEES THE MOTIONS THAT
- 15 HAVE HAD A SECOND, TO THEN COME BACK TO CONSIDER EACH ONE OF
- 16 THOSE. AND THAT WILL BE UNDER ITEM 4. THEN WE'LL GO TO THE
- 17 REMAINDER OF THE AGENDA. WHEN WE GET DOWN TO ITEM 9, IF THERE
- 18 ARE ANY PEOPLE WHO WANT TO BRING ITEMS THAT WERE DEFERRED OVER
- 19 TO TODAY, FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS, THOSE ITEMS CAN BE BROUGHT
- 20 UP AT THE SAME TIME THAT WE'RE TAKING THE MOTIONS FROM
- 21 MEMBERS. AND I ANTICIPATE SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WE -- MOTIONS
- 22 WE HAVE INTRODUCED MAY VERY WELL GO OVER TO AFTER WE HAVE SEEN
- 23 THE EFFECT OF THE STATE BUDGET AND WE HAVE THE FINAL NUMBERS.
- 24 WE MAY WANT TO DO THAT ON SOME OF THE ITEMS, AND THAT'S A
- 25 SUGGESTION THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO KEEP, BECAUSE WE DON'T REALLY



- 1 KNOW THE EXTENT OF THE DAMAGE WE'RE GOING TO GET FROM
- 2 SACRAMENTO AT THIS POINT. HOPEFULLY NOT TOO MUCH, BUT I
- 3 WOULDN'T BE TOO OPTIMISTIC ON THAT, SO I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO
- 4 BE VERY CAREFUL AS WE START SPENDING MONEY WE DON'T HAVE,
- 5 BECAUSE WE MAY NOT REALLY HAVE IT AT ALL, AND OWE IT, SO WE
- 6 DON'T HAVE TO SPEND MONEY THAT WE HAVE TO OWE TO SOMEONE ELSE.
- 7 SO STARTING WITH ITEM NUMBER 1, WE CAN HAVE THE EXECUTIVE CALL
- 8 IT.

9

- 10 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: WE HAVE THE UPDATE FROM THE CHIEF
- 11 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.

- 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. UNDER ITEM NUMBER 1,
- 14 DISCUSSION ITEMS, IT WOULD BE NICE TO INDICATE THAT THERE WAS
- 15 A STATE BUDGET OR A STATE BUDGET WAS PENDING. THE FACT IS THAT
- 16 NOBODY REALLY KNOWS. THERE ACTUALLY IS SOME DISCUSSION GOING
- 17 ON IN SACRAMENTO THAT THEY MAY MEET THEIR JULY 1ST DEADLINE.
- 18 IT'S BEYOND ALL COMPREHENSION HOW THEY WOULD DO THAT, BUT
- 19 THERE IS STILL SOME TALK THAT THAT MAY BE POSSIBLE. THERE ARE
- 20 SO MANY DIFFERENT SCENARIOS THAT HAVE BEEN FLOATED AROUND THAT
- 21 IT IS VERY DIFFICULT FOR US TO ARRIVE AT A REASONABLE FIGURE
- 22 AS TO WHAT OUR EXPOSURE IS. THE VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TRIGGER
- 23 WAS PULLED LAST WEEK BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE. IT'S, I
- 24 GUESS, INTELLECTUALLY INTERESTING TO WATCH THE PLAY-OUT AND
- 25 THE FALL-OUT OF THIS, HAVING LIVED THROUGH THE 1998 ORIGINAL



- 1 DECISION ON REDUCING VEHICLE LICENSE FEES WHEN THE GOVERNOR AT
- 2 THAT TIME, WILSON, AND THE LEGISLATURE MADE IT VERY CLEAR THAT
- 3 IF THE STATE WAS NOT ABLE TO AFFORD THE REBATE TO THE
- 4 TAXPAYERS, THE REBATE PROGRAM WOULD END. AND THERE WERE A LOT
- 5 OF PEOPLE THAT ARE NO LONGER IN SACRAMENTO THAT WERE THERE AT
- 6 THAT TIME. THE LAW, HOWEVER, VERY CLEARLY SAYS THAT WAS THE
- 7 EXPECTATION BECAUSE THE STATE WAS CUTTING LOCAL REVENUES, THEY
- 8 WEREN'T CUTTING THEIR OWN REVENUES. SO WITH THAT ACTION,
- 9 BARRING LEGAL CHALLENGES, BARRING CONSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES
- 10 NEXT MARCH, THE STATE WILL AGAIN START COLLECTING VEHICLE
- 11 LICENSE FEES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT. AS LONG AS THERE IS NOT A
- 12 STATE BUDGET, LOCAL GOVERNMENT WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE THE
- 13 BACKFILL, BECAUSE IT IS A CONTINUOUS APPROPRIATION. SO WITH
- 14 RESPECT TO THE VEHICLE LICENSE FEES, THE EXPOSURE THAT WE WERE
- 15 LOOKING AT ORIGINALLY, APPEARS TO BE GONE, ALTHOUGH IF, IN
- 16 MARCH, THERE IS AN ITEM ON THE BALLOT TO REPEAL V.L.F., WE
- 17 COULD WELL BE FACING A SHORTFALL OF \$1.2 BILLION IN OUR BUDGET
- 18 AT THAT TIME. BEYOND VEHICLE LICENSE FEES THE LEGISLATURE HAS,
- 19 IN CONFERENCE COMMITTEE, TAKEN A NUMBER OF ACTIONS THAT IMPACT
- 20 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE COUNTY, WE ESTIMATE ABOUT \$73
- 21 MILLION, WERE THAT PARTICULAR BUDGET TO BE ADOPTED, THERE IS
- 22 OR IS NOT A \$1.1-BILLION DEAL THAT HAS FLOATED AROUND IN THE
- 23 LAST TWO WEEKS. EVERYBODY SEEMS TO BE DENYING IT, BUT THE MORE
- 24 DENIALS ABOUT A DEAL, THE MORE IT MAKES YOU THINK THERE IS A
- 25 DEAL. THE IMPACT OF THAT COULD BE ANOTHER 70-PLUS MILLION



- 1 DOLLARS OR WE COULD BE LOOKING AT ANYWHERE FROM 150 TO \$262
- 2 MILLION IMPACT ON ON OUR BUDGET. SO THE FACT IS, UNTIL THEY
- 3 HAVE COMPLETED ALL OF THAT, WE REALLY WON'T KNOW HOW MUCH
- 4 ADDITIONAL IMPACT WE HAVE. THAT'S NOT TO SAY, HOWEVER, THAT WE
- 5 SHOULDN'T ADOPT OUR OWN BUDGET; I THINK WE SHOULD AND WE DO
- 6 KNOW WHAT OUR CHALLENGES ARE LOCALLY. \$804 MILLION IN THE
- 7 PROPOSED BUDGET THAT WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH, INCLUDING THE
- 8 HEALTH DEPARTMENT. THE COUNTY HAS DONE VERY WELL WITH THE
- 9 RATING AGENCIES IN NEW YORK UNLIKE THE STATE, BECAUSE YOUR
- 10 BOARD HAS DEMONSTRATED A WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE TO MAKE SOLID
- 11 BUDGET DECISIONS. AND SO I THINK THAT WE SHOULD ADOPT THIS
- 12 WEEK, EITHER TODAY OR TOMORROW, WHENEVER IS APPROPRIATE, A
- 13 FINAL BUDGET WITH WHATEVER CHANGES THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO
- 14 MAKE. WITH THAT, IF I COULD GO TO ITEM NUMBER 2 ON THE AGENDA.
- 15 YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU A COMPILATION OF THE ITEMS FROM
- 16 PUBLIC HEARING, WE'D ASK YOU TO RECEIVE AND FILE THIS
- 17 DOCUMENT. ITEM NUMBER 2, RECEIVE AND FILE. COMMENTS FROM
- 18 PUBLIC HEARINGS?

20 **SPEAKER:** SO MOVED.

21

19

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED WE RECEIVE AND
- 23 FILE. WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED.



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 3. ITEM NUMBER 3 ARE PROPOSED
- 2 CHANGES. MY RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED BUDGET. BY AND
- 3 LARGE, WITH A VERY LITTLE EXCEPTION, WE ARE SIMPLY ROLLING
- 4 ADDITIONAL DOLLARS FROM THE CURRENT YEAR TO NEXT YEAR'S
- 5 BUDGET. WE ARE RECOGNIZING NO ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES
- 6 AT THIS TIME. A NUMBER OF THE STATE AND FEDERALLY-FUNDED
- 7 DEPARTMENTS ARE SEEING SOME INCREASES, SOCIAL SERVICES, FOR
- 8 EXAMPLE, ARE SEEING IMPROVEMENTS IN CALWORKS BECAUSE THE
- 9 GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISED PROPOSAL IS BETTER THAN THE JANUARY
- 10 PROPOSAL, BUT EVEN WITH THAT, UNTIL THEY HAVE A BUDGET, IT'S
- 11 VERY HARD TO RECOGNIZE WHAT THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES ARE. IN
- 12 THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT, WE ARE BRINGING INTO THE BUDGET MEASURE
- 13 "B" FUNDS FOR THE FIRST TIME, ABOUT \$140 MILLION INTO THE
- 14 OPERATING BUDGET OF THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT, \$6 MILLION IN
- 15 PUBLIC HEALTH. THAT WILL RESTORE SOME MONEY INTO THEIR RESERVE
- 16 THAT HAD BEEN ELIMINATED, BUT IT DOES NOT CHANGE. THE BOTTOM
- 17 LINE IS, THERE IS NO CHANGE IN THE FORECAST THAT WE HAVE
- 18 PREVIOUSLY GIVEN YOU ON THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT, WHICH SHOWED
- 19 ALL OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, \$34 MILLION OF SURPLUS IN
- 20 '05/'06. THAT OBVIOUSLY DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE JUDGE'S
- 21 ORDER ON RANCHO, ON THE HUNDRED BEDS, AND THE POTENTIAL
- 22 SHORTFALL OF ABOUT \$75 MILLION NEXT YEAR, AND THE HEALTH
- 23 DEPARTMENT WILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH THAT AT A LATER DATE.
- 24 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, WE ARE RECOGNIZING \$25 MILLION WORTH OF
- 25 INCREASED REVENUE FROM THE M.T.A. CONTRACT. THAT HAPPENED



- 1 SINCE THE PROPOSED BUDGET, AND IT'S ADDING 263 ADDITIONAL
- 2 POSITIONS TO THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. WITH ALL OF THE
- 3 CHANGES, THERE STILL WILL BE ACTUALLY ANOTHER 107 POSITIONS
- 4 REDUCED OR A TOTAL OF 2,265 POSITIONS REDUCED IN THE PROPOSED
- 5 BUDGET. WE ARE, AND I KNOW THERE HAVE BEEN A NUMBER OF
- 6 QUESTIONS, AND WE NEED TO WORK WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
- 7 AND FAMILY SERVICES ON THIS. WE'RE ADDING -- PROPOSING TO ADD
- 8 ANOTHER \$11 MILLION INTO THE BUDGET FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILY
- 9 SERVICES. THAT'S ON TOP OF A \$36 MILLION INCREASE WHICH WAS IN
- 10 THE PROPOSED BUDGET. THEY ARE INDICATING THAT IT IS A RESULT
- 11 OF BOTH A FEDERAL LAW THAT REDUCES THE AMOUNT OF MONEY
- 12 AVAILABLE -- FEDERAL MONEY AVAILABLE FOR KIDS IN OUR SYSTEM
- 13 AND ALSO A CHANGE IN THE DEMOGRAPHIC OF THE KIDS THAT ARE IN
- 14 OUR SYSTEM THAT ARE NO LONGER FEDERALLY ELIGIBLE, BUT WE
- 15 CERTAINLY NEED TO PROVIDE TO THE BOARD PRETTY OUICKLY A
- 16 COMPLETE REPORT ON WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THAT BUDGET, BECAUSE
- 17 THE JUMP JUST STARTED LAST YEAR AND IT'S ACCELERATING. PART OF
- 18 IT, I UNDERSTAND, HAS TO DO WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WELFARE
- 19 REFORM AND THE REDUCTION OF MONEY FOR KIDS FROM THE FEDERAL
- 20 GOVERNMENT.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: COULD I ASK A QUESTION ON THAT AT THIS TIME,
- 23 IS IT?

24

25 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SURE.



1

- SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT'S NOT JUST A JUMP; IT'S OVER A HUNDRED 2
- 3 PERCENT INCREASE OF NET COUNTY COST IN THIS PROGRAM VIRTUALLY
- OVERNIGHT. AND I WOULD IMAGINE, I WOULD'VE EXPECTED OR EXPECT 4
- 5 THAT YOU OR MR. SANDERS OR BOTH OF YOU OR YOUR STAFFS WILL BE
- ABLE TO EXPLAIN TODAY WHAT IT IS THAT'S CAUSED THIS WITH 6
- SPECIFICITY. IF WE'RE BACKFILLING A RETRENCHMENT OF FEDERAL --7
- 8 OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THIS AREA, THEN I THINK WE OUGHT
- TO KNOW THAT, AND WHAT THE IMPLICATIONS ARE FOR THIS. WE GOT 9
- PEOPLE RUNNING AROUND TOWN WHO WOULD LIKE US TO DO EVERYTHING 10
- 11 ON A BLOCK GRANT BASIS WHEN IT COMES TO CHILDREN AND
- EVERYTHING ELSE. AND IF THIS IS THE CONSEQUENCE OF THAT KIND 12
- OF A FEDERAL POLICY, THEN WE OUGHT TO KNOW IT NOW. THIS IS A 13
- HUGE -- WHAT WERE YOU TALKING ABOUT, \$48 MILLION? 14

15

- 16
- C.A.O. JANSSEN: \$48 MILLION.

17

18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: INCREASE IN NET COUNTY COSTS,

19

- 20
- C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: LAST YEAR OR THIS YEAR, WHATEVER THE EARLIER
- 23 YEAR IS, IS \$30 MILLION, SO WE'VE GONE FROM 30 TO \$78 MILLION.

24

C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, YOUR NET COUNTY COST IS \$143 MILLION. 25



```
1
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL WHAT IS IT, WE'RE GOING -- WE'RE
2
3
    INCREASING BY 48 MILLION.
4
5
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'RE INCREASING BY 48 MILLION AGAINST IT'S --
    IT IS A SIGNIFICANT --
6
7
8
    SUP. KNABE: INCREASING BY 48 MILLION THIS YEAR?
9
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH, 36 PLUS 11.
10
11
12
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH? 37 PLUS 11.
13
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: AGAINST A BASE OF 143 --
14
15
16
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND I THOUGHT THAT THE --
17
18
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: BUT YOUR POINT IS WELL TAKEN, WHATEVER IT IS,
19
    SUPERVISOR. AND I DON'T KNOW IF THE DEPARTMENT IS HERE.
20
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL I'D LIKE TO ASK THEM, WE'RE GOING TO BE
21
22
    HERE A WHILE, SO MAYBE WE CAN ASK THEM TO GET DOWN HERE.
23
24
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ARE THEY HERE?
25
```



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND EXPLAIN WHAT IT IS, WE'LL FIND -- EITHER
- 2 THEY'RE HERE OR WE'LL GET SOMEBODY HERE, SO LET'S COME BACK TO
- 3 THAT ITEM.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND BUT, PARDON ME? RIGHT, GET 'EM HERE, AND
- 6 LET THEM KNOW WHAT IT IS WE'RE ASKING THEM SO THAT HE DOESN'T
- 7 COME IN HERE EMPTY-HANDED, SO IF HE CAN BRING WHOEVER WITH HIM
- 8 HE NEEDS. AND THE OTHER THING, DAVID, IS I'D LIKE TO JUST HAVE
- 9 THIS LAID OUT AS TO WHAT IT IS. I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION
- 10 FROM MY STAFF THAT LAST YEAR IT WAS \$30 MILLION; THIS YEAR,
- 11 IT'S 30 PLUS 48.

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY.

16

- 17 SUP. KNABE: BUT PART OF THAT 48'S THE 11 YOU'RE USING TO COVER
- 18 RIGHT FROM THE REDUCING FUND BALANCE RIGHT?

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OH YEAH, BUT IT'S ALL THE NET COUNTY COST
- 21 INCREASE.

22

23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, AND IT'S ALL FOR THE SAME PROGRAM.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT CONSTITUTES THE \$48 MILLION INCREASE
- 2 OVER AND ABOVE 30.

3

4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHATEVER PROGRAM IT -- PORTION OF THE
- 7 PROGRAM IT IS. SO IT'S JUST A LOT OF -- IT'S JUST A LOT OF
- 8 INCREASE. AND IF -- A. I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE NUMBERS
- 9 REALLY ARE, MAKE SURE WE'RE ALL TALKING ABOUT THE SAME
- 10 NUMBERS. NUMBER 2, WHAT'S THE CAUSE OF THIS, AND IF IT --

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, REALLY WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT
- 13 IT.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND WHAT'S THE PROJECTION THE FOLLOWING
- 16 FISCAL YEAR, FOR EXAMPLE. THIS IS OFF THE CHARTS. OKAY.

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY. OTHER ITEMS, I THINK, MADAM CHAIR, I'VE
- 19 COVERED MOST OF THE -- MOST OF THE ADDITIONAL ITEMS IN THE
- 20 CHANGE LETTER.

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE CHANGE
- 23 ORDER ITEMS? ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE CHANGE ORDER ITEMS?
- 24 THE C.A.O.'S CHANGE ORDERS? ALL RIGHT. DO YOU WANT TO ADOPT
- 25 THESE WITH THE EXCEPTION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES AND



- 1 COME BACK TO THAT, OR DO YOU WANT TO PUT THIS WHOLE THING
- 2 OVER?

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, WHETHER YOU -- EITHER WAY, IT WOULD WORK
- 5 BECAUSE YOU'RE NOT -- UNTIL WE ADOPT THE FINAL BUDGET YOU CAN
- 6 AMEND THAT.

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WHY DON'T WE ADOPT EVERYTHING ELSE AND COME
- 9 BACK FOR THE CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES.

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH.

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO MOVED.

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, SO IT'S MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY,
- 16 SECONDED BY KNABE, NO ITEM NUMBER 3, THE CHANGE ORDERS.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'RE JUST ON ITEM NUMBER 3.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT HE HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE INCREASE IN
- 21 NET COUNTY COSTS FOR CHILDREN SERVICES.

22

23 SUP. KNABE: THE MOTION IS THE EXCEPTION.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES, WHICH
- 2 WE'LL PUT OVER TO -- AS SOON AS SOMEONE COMES TO EXPLAIN IT.
- 3 WITHOUT OBJECTION, THEN, THIS ITEM IS ADOPTED, WITH THE
- 4 EXCEPTION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES. AS SOON AS SOMEONE
- 5 FROM CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES COMES IN, WE'LL RECONSIDER
- 6 THAT ITEM. ALL RIGHT. WE'LL NOW GO TO 4, WHICH WOULD BE
- 7 REVISIONS, ADDITIONS, AND CHANGES TO THE C.A.O.'S BUDGET
- 8 RECOMMENDATIONS, AND WE'RE GOING TO START WITH THE FIRST
- 9 DISTRICT.

10

- 11 SUP. MOLINA: THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR AND MEMBERS. I AM
- 12 COGNIZANT I THINK AS ALL OF US ARE, THAT THIS BUDGET CERTAINLY
- 13 AS A BUDGET DOESN'T MEET ALL OF OUR NEEDS AND ALL OF THE NEEDS
- 14 OF OR CONSTITUENTS, AND IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT, AT A TIME LIKE
- 15 THIS, WE'RE MAKING THE KINDS OF CUTS IN MANY OF THE
- 16 DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE SO ESSENTIAL TO THE WELL BEING OF MANY OF
- 17 OUR FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES THAT WE REPRESENT. BUT I THINK IT
- 18 IS PROBABLY ONLY THE BEGINNING OF, UNFORTUNATELY, PROBABLY
- 19 MORE CUTS THAT WILL HAVE TO BE MADE LATER ON. SO I WANT TO
- 20 UNDERSTAND THAT WHILE WE WOULD BE IMPLEMENTING THIS BUDGET
- 21 WITH WHATEVER AMENDMENTS THAT ARE MADE, WE AGAIN WILL PROBABLY
- 22 BE REVISITING THIS BUDGET IN SEPTEMBER OR WHENEVER THE
- 23 LEGISLATURE HAS COMPLETED THEIR BUDGETARY PROCESS, IS THAT
- 24 CORRECT?



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

2

- 3 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT, SO WHILE I UNDERSTAND THAT, I WANT TO
- 4 BE AS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE AS POSSIBLE, BUT AT THE SAME TIME,
- 5 I KNOW THAT THAT MEANS DIFFERENT THINGS TO DIFFERENT FOLKS,
- 6 AND I WANT TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT -- I HAVE A SLEW OF MOTIONS
- 7 THAT I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE, BUT I'M GOING TO BE VERY
- 8 CONSERVATIVE AS I THINK WE ALL NEED TO BE AT THIS TIME.

9

- 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I THINK THAT IF YOU'LL INTRODUCE THE
- 11 MOTIONS, THOSE MOTIONS WHERE THERE IS A SECOND, WE'LL -- CAN
- 12 WE HAVE A BOARD PUT UP? OKAY.

13

14 SUP. MOLINA: THEY WILL PUT UP --

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THEY'LL PUT UP A BOARD?

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: AND KEEP TRACK.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THOSE MOTIONS WHERE THERE'S A SECOND WILL
- 21 APPEAR UP ON THE BOARD AND THE OTHERS, WE'LL PUT OVER TO AFTER
- 22 BUDGET DELIBERATIONS.

23

24 SUP. MOLINA: AND --



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND -- I'M SORRY, AFTER THE FINAL BUDGET
- 2 STATEMENT JUST PASSED.

3

4 SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT. BECAUSE I DO THINK, I'M SORRY?

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I LIKED IT BETTER WHEN WE HAD THAT
- 7 BLACKBOARD AND WE COULD ERASE IT.

8

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE COULD ERASE IT A LOT EASIER.

10

11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: CONFUSE EVERYBODY AND.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: WELL, UNFORTUNATELY, NOW WE CAN'T CONFUSE THEM,
- 14 IT'LL BE ON THERE RIGHT?

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.

- 18 SUP MOLINA: I BET YOU THERE'LL STILL BE CONFUSION. NO, I'D
- 19 LIKE TO INTRODUCE A MOTION, AND LIKE I SAID, I DO HAVE OTHERS
- 20 I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE CUTS IN VARIOUS AREAS, WHETHER IT BE
- 21 OUR PARKS, WHETHER IT BE OUR COPS PROGRAM OR VARIOUS PROGRAMS
- 22 IN THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AND SO ON, BUT AT THE SAME TIME,
- 23 I'M MINDFUL OF WHAT OUR SITUATION IS, AND THIS BUDGET THAT I
- 24 AM PROPOSING, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT'S IMPORTANT TO ME IS TO
- 25 TRY TO FIND THE MONEY WITHIN THE BUDGET AND NOT NECESSARILY



- 1 JUST SAY TO DAVID, "GO OUT AND HUSTLE IT AND COME BACK AND LET
- 2 US KNOW WHERE IT'S COMING FROM." BUT I DO THINK IT SETS A
- 3 PRIORITY AS TO WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING. IT HAS BEEN PAINFUL,
- 4 AND IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN TO WATCH ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT
- 5 RESOURCES IN OUR COMMUNITY CONSTANTLY BE ON THE CHOPPING
- 6 BLOCK, AND THAT IS OUR LIBRARIES. IT'S BEEN A CONCERN OF MINE
- 7 AND, IN MY COMMUNITY, THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS WHERE IT IS THE
- 8 ONLY VALUABLE RESOURCE BESIDES THE PARK THAT IS THERE THAT
- 9 HELPS CHILDREN EVERY SINGLE DAY, AND THE KIND OF CUTS THAT
- 10 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT ARE VERY DRAMATIC, AND IT'S REALLY
- 11 UNFORTUNATE THE LEGISLATURE DOESN'T JOIN MORE SO IN TRYING TO
- 12 FIND THE RESOURCES NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN OUR LIBRARIES. BUT
- 13 I'M ASKING THAT THE CUTS BE RESTORED. SO MY MOTION IS HERE,
- 14 AND I WILL PASS IT OUT, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FISCAL YEAR,
- 15 THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ASK COUNTY COUNSEL TO SET ASIDE 3.48
- 16 MILLION INTO THE PROVISIONAL FINANCING UNIT FROM THE \$167
- 17 MILLION THAT WERE SPENT ON OUR LEGAL COSTS TO DETERMINE IF
- 18 SOME OR ALL THE MONEY COULD BE SAVED THROUGH THE LITIGATION
- 19 MANAGEMENT REFORMS. AS OF TODAY, COUNTY COUNSEL HAS HAD TO USE
- 20 THIS FUND -- HAS NOT -- THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE, HAS NOT HAD
- 21 TO USE THIS FUND. SO THE MONEY'S STILL THERE. THESE SAVINGS IN
- 22 LITIGATION CAN NOW BE ALLOTTED TO AVOID SOME OF THE CUTS IN
- 23 OUR LIBRARY SERVICES. THE LIBRARY DEPARTMENT IS FACING A \$7
- 24 MILLION DEFICIT THAT WILL RESULT IN THE CLOSURE OF 15
- 25 LIBRARIES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY. THE REMAINING SOURCE TO FILL



- 1 THE GAP IN OUR LIBRARY SYSTEM CAN BE FILLED WITH A PORTION OF
- 2 THE PROVISIONAL FINANCING UNIT RECOMMENDED AT 24 MILLION FOR
- 3 L.A. COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. I THEREFORE MOVE THAT,
- 4 NUMBER ONE, WE ALLOCATE AND TRANSFER 4. 220,000, IS THAT
- 5 CORRECT, FROM THE L.A.C.U.S. PROVISIONAL FINANCING UNIT TO THE
- 6 LIBRARY BUDGET AND, NUMBER TWO, THAT WE ALLOCATE AND TRANSFER
- 7 3.48 MILLION FROM THE LEGAL SETTLEMENT COST PROVISIONAL
- 8 FINANCING UNIT TO THE LIBRARY BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
- 9 2003/2004. I WOULD LIKE TO ADD AN AMENDMENT TO THAT AS WELL.
- 10 IT'S MANY OF THE COMMUNITIES HAVE -- ARE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT
- 11 THE CUTS AND THEY HAVE BEEN LOBBYING MANY OF US, AND
- 12 PARTICULARLY MYSELF, AND IT REALLY CONCERNS ME BECAUSE, YEARS
- 13 AGO, WE HAD A SPECIAL TAX THAT WAS PUT IN PLACE AND WE ASKED
- 14 THE CITIES TO JOIN AND TO SHARE WITH THEIR CONSTITUENTS. SOME
- 15 OF THE CITY COUNCILS DID SO, AND SOME DID NOT, AND YET SOME OF
- 16 THE CLOSURES THAT ARE GOING ON SHOULD GO ON INTO THOSE CITIES
- 17 WHERE THERE'S NO HELP FROM THE CITY-ELECTED OFFICIALS. SO I AM
- 18 AMENDING THIS MOTION JUST TO INCLUDE THAT THIS ACTION WOULD BE
- 19 CONTINGENT ON A REQUIREMENT THAT ALL CITIES SERVED BY THE
- 20 COUNTY LIBRARIES THAT ARE NOT CURRENTLY PARTICIPATING IN THE
- 21 LIBRARY SPECIAL TAX PLACE A MEASURE ON THEIR LOCAL BALLOT BY
- JUNE 30TH OF 2004 TO GIVE THEIR VOTERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE
- 23 ON WHETHER TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SPECIAL TAX, BASICALLY
- 24 CREATING A BASELINE FOR OUR LIBRARIES. SO THAT IS THE ONLY
- 25 MOTION THAT I HAVE, MADAM CHAIR.



1 2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I'LL SECOND IT. 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MADAM CHAIR? 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES. 6 7 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IS THERE AN AMENDMENT TO THAT THAT'D BE APPROPRIATE NOW OR? 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES IT WOULD BE. 11 12 13 SUP. MOLINA: IT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE ATTACHED, WE DIDN'T HAVE TIME TO TYPE IT UP. 14 15 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT YOU HAVE ANOTHER AMENDMENT? 17 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO, NO I'M FINE. I WANTED TO SUGGEST AND I -19 - SINCE THE MOTION APPROPRIATES ALL THE MONEY NECESSARY FOR THE FULL YEAR TO RESTORE THE LIBRARIES THE FULL YEAR, WHETHER 20 WE COULD INCLUDE IN THIS -- ASSUMING WE APPROVE THE WHOLE 21 22 THING, THAT WE PUT A FREEZE IN PLACE OR THAT WE AUTHORIZE IT 23 FOR A QUARTER AND THEN PUT A FREEZE IN PLACE SO THAT BY OCTOBER 1ST, OR PICK A -- WHATEVER DATE, IF YOU WANT TO MAKE 24 25 IT SIX MONTHS, BUT SO THAT AT LEAST WHEN WE SEE WHAT THE STATE



- 1 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS ARE, THAT WE HAVE A -- WE'RE IN A POSITION
- 2 TO REVISIT THIS ISSUE, AMONG OTHERS, DURING THE COURSE OF THE
- 3 FISCAL YEAR. GO AHEAD AND APPROVE IT ALL, BUT HAVE THE BOARD
- 4 COME BACK ON A THREE-VOTE BASIS TO REVISIT THE ISSUE BEFORE
- 5 THE THRESHOLD. IF IT WERE THREE MONTHS, THEN BY OCTOBER 1ST,
- 6 WE WOULD HAVE TO TAKE OTHER ACTION TO PROCEED INTO THE
- 7 REMAINDER OF THE FISCAL YEAR.

8

- 9 SUP. MOLINA: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY, I AM WILLING TO ACCEPT
- 10 THAT AS LONG AS THAT BE A CONDITION OF ALL AMENDMENTS THAT ARE
- 11 MADE TODAY.

12

13 **SUP. KNABE:** OF WHAT?

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT.

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL AMENDMENTS? I THINK THAT'S REASONABLE.

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL APPROPRIATIONS.

20

21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL APPROPRIATIONS.

- 23 SUP. KNABE: WELL THEN I JUST NEED A POINT OF CLARIFICATION, I
- 24 MEAN DOES THAT PUT -- WHAT DOES THAT -- WE'RE APPROVING THE
- 25 TOTAL AMOUNT BASED ON YOUR MOTION?



```
1
2
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, CORRECT.
3
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT, BUT THEY HAVE TO PUT IT -- THOSE WHO
4
5
    DON'T HAVE AN ASSESSMENT.
6
7
    SUP. MOLINA: YOU SECOND IT, SO FAR.
8
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I SECONDED IT.
10
11
    SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT.
12
13
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT THOSE THAT HAVE -- DON'T HAVE THE
14
    ASSESSMENT WOULD HAVE TO PUT IT ON BY JUNE 30TH IN ORDER TO
    QUALIFY FOR ANY OF THESE FUNDS.
15
16
    SUP. MOLINA: THIS YEAR.
17
18
19
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THIS YEAR.
20
21
    SUP. KNABE: OKAY.
22
23
    SUP. MOLINA: ANY TIME THIS YEAR.
24
```



- 1 SUP. KNABE: WELL WE CAN SEPARATE THAT PORTION OF THE MOTION
- 2 ALL AT THAT POINT.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THEY DON'T HAVE TO GET IT APPROVED, THEY
- 5 JUST HAVE TO PUT IT ON?

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: THEY JUST HAVE TO PUT IT ON, THAT'S THE ISSUE, IS
- 8 THAT SOME OF THESE COUNCIL PEOPLE DIDN'T EVEN -- WEREN'T EVEN
- 9 WILLING TO APPROVE A MOTION TO PUT IT ON BEFORE THEIR OWN
- 10 TAXPAYERS. BUT DON, SO THAT YOU KNOW, IT DOES APPROVE THE
- 11 WHOLE YEAR OF FUNDING, BUT IT WOULD SAY THAT IT IS CONDITIONED
- 12 THAT IN THE FUTURE I'M NOT GOING TO DO ANY OF THE HEAVY
- 13 LIFTING FOR THOSE CITIES THAT AREN'T EVEN WILLING TO PUT THIS
- 14 ON THE BALLOT.

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT.

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: AND FOR EXAMPLE --

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DON?

21

- 22 SUP. KNABE: THE PROBLEM I HAVE IS MANY OF THE CITIES THAT DID
- 23 PUT ON A BALLOT AND PASSED THEY'RE STILL GETTING THE
- 24 REDUCTION, SO I MEAN THAT'S WHY I SUPPORT YOUR MOTION.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: NO, I UNDERSTAND, AND I WANT TO BE SUPPORTIVE AS
- 2 WELL. THE PROBLEM IS THAT THERE ARE SOME OF THESE CITIES THAT
- 3 ARE JUST -- THEY ARE SENDING THEIR CONSTITUENTS OVER TO LOBBY
- 4 US, AND I WANT TO TURN AROUND AND GET THEM TO GO BACK TO THEIR
- 5 CITY COUNCILS AND SAY AT LEAST PUT IT ON THE BALLOT AND GIVE
- 6 TAXPAYERS AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THEIR OWN DECISION.

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND I WOULD LIKE TO ALSO ADD THAT WE
- 9 CONTINUE DURING THIS PERIOD OF TIME TO WORK WITH THOSE CITIES
- 10 TO TRY TO ADOPT AN ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF FINANCE ON A LONG-
- 11 TERM BASIS FOR SOME OF THESE LIBRARIES, BECAUSE THIS IS NOT
- 12 JUST, I MEAN, WE'RE DOING THIS, BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT
- 13 THERE'S GOING TO BE MONEY FOR NEXT YEAR. SO I DO THINK THAT WE
- 14 -- I TELL YOU IN MY CASE IN MY CITIES, I'M TRYING TO WORK WITH
- 15 THEM TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF OPERATION FOR LONG-
- 16 TERM.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: I WOULD ACCEPT THAT MOTION, BECAUSE THIS IS
- 19 REALLY ONE TIME. THAT'S ALL THIS IS. THIS IS GOING TO BE A
- 20 SITUATION THAT WILL COME BACK AGAIN UNTIL THOSE CITIES START
- 21 HELPING US. THEY ARE AN UNBELIEVABLE RESOURCE TO EVERY CITY IN
- 22 WHERE THESE LIBRARIES ARE LOCATED.

- 24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND WE'LL GET SOME LANGUAGE FOR THAT, THE
- 25 SUGGESTION THAT I'VE MADE, BECAUSE WE ARE WORKING WITH SOME OF



- 1 THEM AND WE WANT TO CONTINUE TO DO THAT AND WE WANT THE
- 2 PRESSURE ON FOR THEM TO AGREE TO IT TOO.

3

- 4 SUP. KNABE: RIGHT, BUT WE ALSO NEED SOME CLARIFICATION. WE DO
- 5 HAVE SOME CITIES THAT ARE PAYING MORE THAN WHAT THEY'RE
- 6 GETTING.

7

8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S RIGHT, OH, YES.

9

- 10 SUP. KNABE: YOU KNOW, SO I MEAN I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU FORCE A
- 11 CITY LIKE THAT TO PUT SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT WHEN THEY'RE
- 12 PAYING --

13

14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THEY ALREADY HAVE ADOPTED IT, THOUGH.

15

16 SUP. KNABE: NO. SOME ARE JUST -- SOME HAVE AND SOME HAVEN'T.

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: BUT MR. KNABE IT ALREADY EXCLUDES THOSE CITIES.

19

- 20 SUP. KNABE: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I JUST -- WELL, WE'LL TALK ABOUT
- 21 IT LATER.

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THOSE CITIES WHERE
- 24 THERE IS A EXCESS. THEY'RE PAYING MORE IN. I THINK THAT'S ONE



- 1 OF THE THINGS THAT HAS TO BE CONTINUED TO WORK WITH. ALL
- 2 RIGHT. WITHOUT OBJECTION, THEN --

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND ON THE AMENDMENT DEALING WITH THE
- 5 QUARTERLY REVIEW, OR THE OCTOBER 1ST REVIEW, WOULD YOU WANT ME
- 6 TO JUST BRING IN A GENERIC MOTION THAT APPLIES TO ALL OF THE
- 7 APPROPRIATIONS?

8

9 SUP. MOLINA: AS LONG AS, YES --

10

11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WE'LL TYPE IT UP.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: AS I SAID, I'M WILLING TO ACCEPT IT WITHIN MINE
- 14 AS LONG AS IT'S INCLUDED IN EVERY ONE OF OURS, NO PROBLEM.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. AND WE'LL COME BACK TO VOTE ON
- 17 THIS, OR DO YOU WANT TO TAKE IT UP AND VOTE ON THIS ONE NOW...
- 18 WHAT'S THE PLEASURE? DO YOU WANT TO TAKE A VOTE ON THIS NOW OR
- 19 PUT IT OVER.

20

21 SUP. KNABE: WE'LL JUST COME BACK ON THIS.

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE'LL COME BACK WITH EVERYTHING. ALL RIGHT.
- 24 SUPERVISOR MOLINA, YOU HAVE ANOTHER MOTION? YOU HAVE NO OTHER
- 25 MOTIONS?



SUP. MOLINA: THAT'S MY ONLY MOTION. . 2 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. I HAVE ONE MOTION THAT WE'LL 4 5 PASS OUT, AND THIS RELATES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AT AUGUSTUS HAWKINS CENTER, \$375,000 FOR A -- TO PUT UP THE 6 CAPITAL -- TO MAKE THE IMPROVEMENTS FOR AN INSTITUTE FOR 7 8 RECURRING ILLNESSES. THAT'S THE ONLY MOTION THAT I HAVE. SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY? OH, IS THERE A SECOND TO THAT? \$375,000 FOR THE PUTTING IN THE FACILITIES FOR A MENTAL HEALTH 10 11 FOR RECURRING ILLNESSES. 12 13 SUP. KNABE: SECOND.

14

1

15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THE SECOND, AND WE'LL COME BACK

16 TO THAT. SUPERVISOR --

17

18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ARE WE INTRODUCING ALL MOTIONS NOW?

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL MOTIONS, EXCEPT FOR THOSE THAT WENT
- 21 OVER. OKAY, YOU HAD THAT ONE OVER, YOU JUST PASS IT OUT, IS
- 22 THIS IT?

23

24 **SPEAKER:** YES.



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY JUST PASS IT OUT.

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVKSY: ALL RIGHT, MADAM CHAIR I JUST WILL MOVE THAT
- 4 GIVEN THE REDUCTIONS IN THE NET COUNTY COSTS IMPOSED ON ALL
- 5 DEPARTMENTS IN THE F.Y. '03/'04 PROPOSED BUDGET, THE BOARD OF
- 6 SUPERVISORS NET COUNTY COST ALLOCATIONS SHOULD ALSO BE
- 7 REDUCED. I THINK IT'S A MOTION YOU AND I ARE BOTH INTRODUCING
- 8 TOGETHER. WE THEREFORE MOVE THAT EACH SUPERVISOR'S OPERATING
- 9 BUDGET BE REDUCED BY 5 PERCENT FOR FISCAL YEAR '03/'04 AND IT
- 10 WAS ASKED WHERE WILL THE MONEY GO, I WOULD SAY PUT IN THE
- 11 DESIGNATION FOR BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTIES.

12

- 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SECOND. AND IT'S A TRANSFER TO BUDGET
- 14 UNCERTAINTIES. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER MOTIONS? SUPERVISOR
- 15 KNABE?

- 17 SUP. KNABE: YES. MADAM CHAIR, THE GENERAL FUND CUT BEING
- 18 RECOMMENDED FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY LIFEGUARDS IS OBVIOUSLY
- 19 A HUGE ISSUE, AND SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY AND I HAVE A JOINT
- 20 MOTION THAT WOULD -- BECAUSE IT DRAMATICALLY IMPACTS THE
- 21 SUMMER BEACH STAFFING. SO MY MOTION WOULD BE TO THEREFORE MOVE
- 22 THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO REALLOCATE THE 650,000
- 23 FROM THE P.F.U. ACCOUNTS TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR LIFEGUARD
- 24 SUMMER STAFFING FROM JUNE 29TH, 2003 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6TH,



- 1 2003 IN FUNDING FOR THE WATER RESCUE TEAM. THAT'S A JOINT
- 2 MOTION.

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I THINK YEAH, ALL RIGHT, I THINK
- 5 YAROSLAVSKY IS SECONDING THAT. YES.

6

- 7 SUP. KNABE: ALSO, JUST TO PUT ON FOR DISCUSSION AS WELL, TWO
- 8 OTHER ONES. ONE IS THAT THE C.A.O. BE INSTRUCTED TO REALLOCATE
- 9 FROM THE P.F.U. \$2,008,631 TO THE V.A.'S FAMILY VIOLENCE
- 10 DIVISION AND 2.7 TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S SEX CRIME
- 11 DIVISION.

12

- 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: 2.-- HOW MUCH WAS IT? 2.7 TO FAMILY
- 14 VIOLENCE? IS THERE A SECOND? 2.8, I'M SORRY. IS THERE A
- 15 SECOND?

16

17 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHAT WAS THE MOTION?

18

19 SUP. MOLINA: WHICH MOTION IS THIS NOW?

20

21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SUPERVISOR KNABE HAS --

22

- 23 SUP. MOLINA: THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT, CAN I JUST ASK A QUESTION?
- 24 WHERE IS IT COMING FROM, 'CAUSE I'M NOT SURE.?

25

SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT.



```
SUP. KNABE: P.F.U.
2
3
    SUP. MOLINA: WHICH P.F.U.?
4
5
    SUP. KNABE: THAT'S THE ONE WHERE --
6
7
    SUP. MOLINA: THERE'S A LOT OF P.F.U.S AROUND HERE.
8
    SUP. KNABE: THE ONE WE MOVED THE CONTINGENCY DOLLARS TO.
10
11
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT COULD WE GET A CLARIFICATION ON
12
    THIS?
13
14
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK IT MIGHT BE BETTER THAT WE TALK ABOUT
15
    THE APPROPRIATE FUND WHEN WE FINISH.
16
    SUP. KNABE: OKAY.
17
18
19
    SUP. MOLINA: WHEN?
20
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: TODAY. LATER TODAY WHEN WE GO THROUGH THE
21
22
   MOTIONS, BECAUSE I'M NOT SURE -- FOR EXAMPLE, ON 3.4 MILLION
23
   LITIGATION COSTS --
24
```



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: -- THAT MONEY ACTUALLY HAS -- WILL ROLL TO
- 3 FUND BALANCE, SO WE NEED TO IDENTIFY IT PROBABLY IN ANOTHER
- 4 FUND.

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: BUT WHAT, WHAT, WHAT? WHAT DID YOU JUST
- 7 SAY, WILL WHAT?

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ROLL TO FUND BALANCE. IT WASN'T SPENT, SO IT'S
- 10 ASSUMED IN FUND BALANCE, SO WE JUST NEED TO GET SOME TECHNICAL
- 11 -- YOU JUST NEED TO TELL US WHAT YOU'RE WANTING TO DO AND THEN
- 12 WE'LL GIVE YOU THE SPECIFICS OF HOW TO DO IT.

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: YES BUT THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING THE QUESTION ON
- 15 THIS ONE.

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. AND THE SAME ANSWER IS PROVISIONAL
- 18 FINANCING MAY NOT BE THE RIGHT PLACE TO TAKE IT FROM. THE
- 19 CONTINGENCY MIGHT BE A BETTER PLACE.

20

21 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT.

22

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. WE'LL COME BACK TO THAT ONE AS
- 24 WELL.



- 1 SUP. KNABE: OKAY, AND MADAM CHAIR, I JUST WANT TO KNOW FOR
- 2 DISCUSSION THAT THE BOARD INSTRUCTS THE C.A.O. TO REALLOCATE
- 3 \$6,553,000 TO THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF
- 4 THE C.O.P.S. PROGRAM, A-1 COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICE
- 5 DEPUTIES.

6

7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THAT GOES OVER, TOO.

8

9 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S ALL I HAVE.

10

- 11 SUP. MOLINA: AND THIS ONE, AGAIN, WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME
- 12 FROM?

13

14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WITHIN THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT?

15

16 SUP. KNABE: NO, NO. NO, NO.

17

18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OH. NO. OKAY. WELL --

19

- 20 SUP. KNABE: WE'LL, I MEAN WE'LL CLARIFY FOR WHICH ACCOUNT BUT
- 21 I PUT THE PROVISIONAL FINANCE --

22

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE'LL JUST -- WE'LL CLARIFY IT WHEN WE COME
- 24 BACK.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: BUT THEN AGAIN WE CAN JUST INTRODUCE A WHOLE LOT
- 2 OF MOTIONS AND LET HIM FIGURE OUT WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM?

3

4 SUP. KNABE: NO, THAT'S -- AGAIN, IT'S FROM THE P.F.U.

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY. I GUESS I'LL START MY MOTIONS SO YOU CAN
- 7 CALL ME BACK ON THE ROUNDUP AGAIN.

8

9 SUP. KNABE: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD.

10

11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: I JUST -- YVONNE, I JUST SAID FROM THE VERY
- 14 BEGINNING THAT I THOUGHT WE SHOULD LOOK AT WHERE THE MONEY
- 15 SHOULD COME FROM.

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT.

18

- 19 SUP. MOLINA: IF THIS IS GOING TO BE A ROULETTE WHEEL IN WHICH
- 20 WE PUT IN THE P.F.U., THEN I'M WILLING TO DO IT AS WELL.

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL, I THINK THAT WE'LL HAVE A CHANCE TO -
- 23 THE PROBLEM WE HAVE IS IF WE HAVE TWO PEOPLE WHO ARE
- 24 SUPPORTING IT AT LEAST WE SHOULD HAVE A DISCUSSION OF IT. AND
- 25 AT THAT POINT, IF THERE'S NO SOURCE OF THE MONEY, THEN I DOUBT



- 1 SERIOUSLY IF THERE ARE GOING TO BE THREE VOTES FOR IT. BUT I
- 2 WOULD ENCOURAGE NO ONE TO GO OUT AND JUST START THE ROULETTE
- 3 WHEEL VERY -- BY THROWING IN EVERYTHING THEY CAN THINK OF. AND
- 4 I SAY THAT TO EVERYONE WHO IS YET TO COME UP. ARE YOU
- 5 FINISHED? SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH?

6

- 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ALL RIGHT. RELATIVE TO THE M.R.S.A.
- 8 INFECTION, WHICH HAS BEEN AN EPIDEMIC IN OUR COUNTY JAILS AND
- 9 CURRENTLY THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT'S REPORTING OVER 100 NEW
- 10 CASES IN THE JAILS EACH MONTH, I WOULD MOVE THAT THE BOARD
- 11 APPROVE A \$556,778 BUDGET AUGMENTATION FROM THE DESIGNATION
- 12 FOR BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTIES FUND TO THE SHERIFF FOR ONE
- 13 PHYSICIAN SPECIALIST EPIDEMIOLOGIST, THREE PUBLIC HEALTH
- 14 NURSES AND ONE OPERATION ASSISTANT, ONE TO AUGMENT THE
- 15 COMMUNICABLE DISEASE UNIT IN THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT.

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND? ALL RIGHT. NEXT MOTION.
- 18 I DIDN'T HEAR. WAS THERE A SECOND FOR THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
- 19 FOR?

20

21 SUP. KNABE: NO.

22

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, NEXT MOTION, PLEASE.



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE NEXT MOTION IS THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR
- 2 THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION RECOMMENDS TERMINATING
- 3 AGREEMENTS WITH THE STATE FOR THE OPERATION OF CASTAIC LAKE
- 4 AND PLACITA CANYON PARK -- PLACERITA CANYON PARK. THE DIRECTOR
- 5 OF PARKS AND REC. IN MY OFFICE HAVE BEEN IN DIALOGUE WITH THE
- 6 STATE OFFICIALS TO SECURE FUNDING FOR THE COUNTY TO CONTINUE
- 7 THE OPERATIONS AT BOTH FACILITIES. OVERALL COSTS TO RUN BOTH
- 8 FACILITIES IS \$2 MILLION. THE STATE CANNOT COMMIT FUNDING
- 9 UNTIL THE FINAL BUDGET IS APPROVED. HOWEVER, DISCUSSIONS HAVE
- 10 BEEN FAVORABLE, AND MY OFFICE HAS ALLOCATED FUNDING TO KEEP
- 11 PLACERITA CANYON OPEN THROUGH AUGUST PENDING ADOPTION OF THE
- 12 STATE BUDGET. THE C.A.O. HAS RECOMMENDED FUNDING OF CASTAIC
- 13 LAKE THROUGH JULY 9TH, WHICH DOES NOT PROVIDE SUFFICIENT TIME
- 14 FOR THE STATE TO ADOPT THEIR BUDGET. I'D MOVE THAT THE BOARD
- 15 AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION TO CONTINUE
- 16 OPERATING CASTAIC LAKE THROUGH AUGUST AT A ESTIMATED COST OF
- 17 \$400,000 THROUGH USE OF FUNDS IN THE OPERATING BUDGET FOR
- 18 2003/2004. I'D FURTHER MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O.
- 19 TO REVIEW ANY SAVINGS IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR TO COVER
- 20 THOSE COSTS IF THE STATE DOES NOT ALLOCATE FUNDING.

22 SUP. KNABE: SECOND.

24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED. THAT'S ON THE CASTAIC

25 LAKE.

21



1

2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: DO YOU HAVE A COPY OF THAT?

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES. I DIDN'T SEE THE 400,000 IN HERE. OH,
- 5 YES, I DO, IT'S IN -- THE 400,000 IS IN THE MOTION.

6

- 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY. PROBATION ANTICIPATES \$3.38 MILLION IN
- 8 ADDITIONAL REVENUES THIS FISCAL YEAR. WITHOUT OFFICIAL ACTION
- 9 TO APPROPRIATE THIS YEAR'S REVENUES TO NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET,
- 10 PROBATION'S EXCESSES REVENUE WILL ROLL TO A FUND BALANCE AND
- 11 WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR PROBATION TO USE WITHOUT ACCESS TO
- 12 THESE FUNDS, THE DEPARTMENT HAS NO ABILITY TO MITIGATE THE
- 13 N.C.C. REDUCTIONS AND WILL HAVE TO CURTAIL PROGRAMS. I WOULD
- 14 THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE PROBATION BE ALLOWED TO CARRY OVER
- 15 \$3.38 MILLION FOR FISCAL YEAR '02/'03, EXCESS FUND BALANCE TO
- 16 MITIGATE ANTICIPATED CURTAILMENTS AND FISCAL YEAR '03/'04
- 17 INCLUDING THE CLOSURE OF CAMP ROCKY AND OPERATION REED.

18

19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND?

20

21 SUP. KNABE: SECOND.

- 23 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH HAS INCLUDED
- 24 CURTAILMENTS OF \$10 MILLION IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2003/'04
- 25 PROPOSED BUDGET DUE TO THE STATE'S FINANCIAL DEFICIT. THE



- 1 COUNTY'S PROPOSED CURTAILMENT REDUCES COUNTY OPERATED PROGRAMS
- 2 BY \$5.41 MILLION AND CONTRACT SERVICE PROVIDERS BY \$4.59
- 3 MILLION.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I'M SORRY, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ASK
- 6 EVERYONE TO PLEASE BE QUIET.

- 8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH HAS
- 9 IDENTIFIED \$4 MILLION OF UNSPENT SALES TAX REALIGNMENT FUNDS
- 10 FROM FISCAL YEAR '02/'03. IN ADDITION, THE DEPARTMENT HAS
- 11 IDENTIFIED ONE TIME UNSPENT COUNTY GENERAL FUNDS BECAUSE OF
- 12 THE FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE INCREASE FOR FEDERAL
- 13 FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IN THE AMOUNT OF 3.44 AND 1.18 IN
- 14 FEDERAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE AGENCY AND
- 15 PATHWAY TO ALTERNATIVE FOR HOMELESS FUNDS TOTALING \$4.63
- 16 MILLION. NOTABLY, THE STATE'S SB-90 AND REIMBURSEMENT PROCESS
- 17 FOR ASSEMBLY BILL 3632 SCHOOL-BASED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE
- 18 CONTRACTORS COSTS REMAIN INOPERATIVE DUE TO THE STATE'S
- 19 FAILURE TO MAKE PAYMENTS. THIS HAS RESULTED IN UNPAID SB-90
- 20 CONTRACTOR BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000/2001 FOR APPROXIMATELY
- 21 \$4.8 MILLION AND ANOTHER \$10.2 MILLION FOR FISCAL YEAR
- 22 2001/2002. THERE IS A NEED TO PRESERVE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE
- 23 CONTRACTORS FUNDS TO ENSURE THAT THESE PATIENTS HAVE AN
- 24 ADEQUATE LEVEL OF TREATMENT SO THIS VULNERABLE POPULATION DOES
- 25 NOT BECOME PART OF OUR FRAGILE HEALTHCARE OR JAIL SYSTEM. YET



- 1 IT IS NECESSARY TO RESERVE THE \$4 MILLION IN UNSPENT SALES TAX
- 2 REALIGNMENT FUNDS GIVEN THE COUNTY'S EXPERIENCE WITH STATE
- 3 PAYMENTS DURING THE PRESENT ECONOMIC STATE FINANCIAL
- 4 CONDITION. THERE IS NO CERTAINTY THAT THE STATE WILL PAY THE
- 5 \$4 MILLION WITHIN 12 MONTHS. THE NEEDS DEFERRING FOR BOARD
- 6 ACTION TO MID YEAR 2003/04, AT LEAST UNTIL THE STATE FINALIZES
- 7 ITS BUDGET. IT'S IMPERATIVE THAT WE FREEZE THE COUNTY GENERAL
- 8 FUNDS AVAILABLE THROUGH THESE TWO PROGRAMS IN THE COMBINED
- 9 AMOUNT OF \$4.63 MILLION TO REDUCE CONTRACT PROVIDERS'
- 10 CURTAILMENTS FROM 4.59 MILLION TO 2.5 MILLION AND SHOW THE
- 11 COUNTY'S GOOD FAITH EFFORTS TO MAKE FIRST-TIME PORTION
- 12 PAYMENTS 2.13 MILLION FOR SB-90 CLAIMS TO CONTRACTORS WHO HAVE
- 13 RENDERED AB 3632 SERVICES IN FISCAL YEARS 2000/2001, 2001, AND
- 14 2002. I WOULD THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O.,
- 15 THE AUDITOR CONTROLLER AND DIRECTOR OF MENTAL HEALTH TO FREEZE
- 16 THE COUNTY GENERAL FUNDS FOR F.E.M.A.P. AND F.P. AND
- 17 S.A.M.S.H.A. AND P.A.T.H. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4.63 MILLION AND
- 18 REDIRECT THESE FUNDS TO REDUCE CURTAILMENTS FOR CONTRACT
- 19 SERVICES PROVIDERS TO \$2.5 MILLION AND MAKE A PORTION PAYMENT
- 20 OF 2.3 MILLION FOR UNPAID SB-90 CLAIMS AND AB 3632 CONTRACTOR
- 21 SERVICES RENDERED IN FISCAL YEARS 2000/2001, 2001/ 2002.

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WHAT IS THE AMOUNT THAT YOU'RE ASKING TO BE

24 ADDED?

25



1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHERE IS --

2

- 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ARE YOU ASKING FOR 4.6 MILLION, OR ARE YOU
- 4 ASKING FOR 2.13?

5

6 SUP. KNABE: IT SOUNDED LIKE 4.6.

7

8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S NOT CLEAR IN THE MOTION, I WAS --

9

10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: DOCTOR, WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

11

- 12 MARVIN J. SOUTHARD: MARV SOUTHWARD, DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT
- 13 OF MENTAL HEALTH, I'LL DEFER THE DETAILS TO GORIBUNDUS
- 14 INCALSA, THE FINANCE OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT.

15

- 16 GORIBUNDUS INCALSA: THE INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION WOULD BE
- 17 \$4.63 MILLION, AND THAT WOULD BE OFFSET WITH REVENUES FROM THE
- 18 F.F.P. ACCOUNT.

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THAT IS OF HOW MUCH?

21

- 22 GORIBUNUS INCALSA: THE -- IT WOULD BE A TOTAL OF \$4.63 MILLION
- 23 OFFSET. THERE WOULD BE A ZERO NET COUNTY COST.

24

25 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WOULD BE ZERO NET COUNTY COST?

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 2 GORIBUNUS INCALSA: CORRECT. 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND? 4 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SECOND. 6 7 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. SECOND. IT'S SECOND, OKAY. 9 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AND THE LAST ONE IN THIS, WHEN MEASURE B 10 PASSED, FUNDING WAS TO BE ALLOCATED FOR BIO-TERRORISM AND 11 TRAUMA. THE AUDITOR CONTROLLER AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH 12 SERVICES DID NOT IDENTIFY THE FORMULA USED FOR THESE TWO 13 CATEGORIES. THE FIRE CHIEF HAS SUBMITTED A PROPOSAL TO ADDRESS 14 THE NEED FOR THESE FUNDS FOR BIO-TERRORISM BY CREATING A 15 16 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TEAM. IN ADDITION, THE FIRE CHIEF'S PROPOSAL ALSO ADDRESSES THE NEED FOR HELICOPTER TRANSPORTATION 17 18 DUE TO THE LACK OF TRAUMA IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY. THE 19 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES HAS NOT MADE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS TO ALLOCATE THESE FUNDS FOR EITHER OF THESE REQUESTS. IN 20 ADDITION, THE ANTELOPE VALLEY HOSPITAL AND LANCASTER COMMUNITY 21 22 HOSPITAL HAVE EXPRESSED INTEREST IN FUTURE EXPANSION OF TRAUMA 23 SERVICES. THE VALLEY IS HOME TO MANY INDUSTRIAL AEROSPACE COMPANIES WITH THE THREAT OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, EMERGENCY 24

ACCIDENTS, TERRORISM, TRANSPORTS FOR TRAUMA PATIENTS, AND THE



- 1 LACK OF TRAUMA HOSPITALS MAKES THE VALLEY AREA EXTREMELY
- 2 VULNERABLE. THE PROPERTY TAXPAYERS IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY HAVE
- 3 A RIGHT TO HAVE THEIR FUNDS GO TO THESE COMMUNITY BIO-
- 4 TERRORISM AND TRAUMA SERVICES. IT'S IMPERATIVE THAT THE
- 5 DEPARTMENT MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO ADDRESS THESE REQUESTS FROM
- 6 THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AND DISCUSS THE POSSIBILITY OF EXPANDING
- 7 TRAUMA SERVICES WITH LANCASTER COMMUNITY AND ANTELOPE VALLEY
- 8 HOSPITALS. SO I'D MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF
- 9 HEALTH SERVICES, THIS EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MANAGER, AND
- 10 THE FIRE CHIEF TO REPORT BACK ON RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSING
- 11 THE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST. AND THIS INCLUDES D.H.S.
- 12 PROVIDING A DETAILED REPORT ON THE MEASURE "B" FORMULA USED TO
- 13 DETERMINE CATEGORICALLY FUND AND POSITIONS FOR EXISTING PUBLIC
- 14 HEALTH BIO-TERRORISM RESOURCES. FURTHER MOVING THAT THE BOARD
- 15 OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF HEALTH SERVICES THIS
- 16 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS MANAGER TO WORK IN COLLABORATION
- 17 WITH THE TWO HOSPITALS TO DISCUSS WHAT IS NEEDED TO SUBMIT A
- 18 COMPREHENSIVE PROPOSAL TO EXPAND TRAUMA SERVICES WHICH
- 19 INCLUDES THE FOLLOW-UP FROM THE DEPARTMENT WITH THESE
- 20 HOSPITALS, AND WRITTEN BIMONTHLY STATUS REPORTS ON A BIMONTHLY
- 21 BASIS.

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT -- THERE'S NO MONEY IN THERE?

25 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO. IT'S ASKING FOR THE STUDY AND --

24

1

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'M NOT CLEAR WHAT -- HOW THIS RELATES TO 2 TODAY'S AGENDA. IS THAT -- CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT? 3 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS IT IN THE BUDGET? 6 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I'M NOT SURE. IS THE FIRE CHIEF HERE? 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH. I KNOW WHAT THE FIRE CHIEF WANTS. I'M 9 TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU WANT. 10 11 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY, DAVID JANSSEN. 12 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL JUST AS TO THE RELEVANCE, WE DID PUT IN 14 THE CHANGE LETTER SUPERVISOR THE 140 MILLION AND SIX MILLION 15 16 FOR MEASURE B. SO THE ISSUE IS BEFORE YOU. HE DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ASKING FOR ANY OF THAT MONEY TO BE DIRECTED TO THE FIRE, 17 18 AT THIS TIME, ANYWAY, JUST THAT IT BE EVALUATED.

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT, THERE IS NOW AN EVALUATION
- 21 UNDERWAY. IN FACT, I THINK -- IS CAROL GUENTHER HERE? SHE'S
- 22 NOT HERE YET. WE'VE ASKED HER TO COME DOWN, DIRECTOR OF
- 23 EMERGENCY SERVICES. I -- I MEAN I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND, THIS
- 24 IS AN ATTEMPT TO BE RESPONSIVE TO THE FIRE CHIEF'S REQUEST. I
- 25 UNDERSTAND WHAT THE FIRE CHIEF IS REQUESTING. I UNDERSTAND



- 1 THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO BE COMPETITIVE WITH EVERYBODY ELSE IN
- 2 TRYING TO GET A PIECE OF THE PROP B MONEY, BUT THIS APPEARS TO
- 3 FAVOR THEM BEFORE -- THIS APPEARS TO FAVOR THE FIRE
- 4 DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST WITHOUT ANY REFERENCE TO ANY OTHER
- 5 REQUEST OR ANY OTHER OPPORTUNITY THAT WE HAVE, AND ANTELOPE
- 6 VALLEY MAY BE BEST SERVED BY THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, OR IT MAY BE
- 7 BEST SERVED BY SOMEBODY ELSE. AND UNTIL YOU HAVE THE
- 8 COMPARISON AND THE COST COMPARISON, AND THE QUALITY
- 9 COMPARISON, AND ALL THOSE KINDS OF THINGS, WE'RE NOT IN A
- 10 POSITION TO DO THAT. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD INJECT OURSELVES
- 11 INTO THAT PROCESS AT THIS TIME. AND I BELIEVE -- WHERE IS MR.
- 12 JANSSEN?

13

15

18

20

23

14 SUP. ANTONOVICH: HE'S LOOKING FOR THE FIRE CHIEF.

16 SUP. KNABE: ISN'T IT -- ISN'T THIS ALREADY PART OF THE STUDY,

17 THAT'S ONGOING RIGHT NOW ZEV?

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THERE IS MONEY --

21 SUP. KNABE: ISN'T THIS ALREADY PART OF THE STUDY? THE

- 22 EVALUATION THAT'S GOING ON RIGHT NOW WITH MEASURE B?
- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THERE'S MONEY SET ASIDE IN YOUR BUDGET, I
- 25 BELIEVE, FOR SOME \$4 MILLION SET ASIDE TO PROVIDE TRAUMA FOR



- 1 THE THREE AREAS WHERE WE HAVE HOLES. ONE OF THEM IS THE
- 2 ANTELOPE VALLEY, ONE OF THEM IS THE CENTRAL SAN GABRIEL, ONE
- 3 OF THEM IS POMONA.

4

- 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THERE IS 4.4 MILLION I THINK SUPERVISOR, FOR
- 6 INCREASED TRAUMA SERVICES BEYOND THE 18 MILLION THAT WE'RE
- 7 DISTRIBUTING.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: HOW THAT -- WITH WHOM THAT WILL BE SPENT HAS
- 10 YET TO BE DETERMINED, IS THAT CORRECT?

11

12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I CANNOT ANSWER THAT, THE DEPARTMENT --

13

14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING --

15

16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE FIRE CHIEF'S HERE ZEV, CHIEF FREEMAN.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: HE WOULDN'T KNOW ON THAT.

19

20 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE SUPERVISOR HAD A QUESTION.

21

22 CHIEF FREEMAN: YES.

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I REALLY DIDN'T HAVE A QUESTION OF YOU. I
- 25 KNOW WHAT YOU WANT, AND I'M NOT GOING TO KNOCK YOU FOR IT,



- 1 MIKE, YOU'RE DOING THE -- YOUR JOB, BUT YOU'RE NOT THE PERSON
- 2 THAT I WANT TO HAVE ANSWER THE QUESTION. THE QUESTION THAT I
- 3 WANT TO KNOW IS PROBABLY OF CAROL GUENTHER, IS, AND SHE'S ON
- 4 HER WAY DOWN, IS WHAT, YOU KNOW, WHERE ARE WE IN THE PROCESS
- 5 OF DETERMINING HOW THAT 4.4 MILLION IS GOING TO BE SPENT? I
- 6 KNOW YOU WANT IT, AND YOU MAY END UP GETTING PART OR ALL OF
- 7 IT, I DON'T KNOW, BUT WE'RE NOT IN A POSITION TO KNOW THAT
- 8 TODAY, AND I -- AND THIS APPEARS TO PREJUDGE THAT PROCESS, AND
- 9 SO I HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO --

10

11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DO YOU WANT TO PUT THIS OVER?

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY DON'T WE PUT IT OVER UNTIL SHE GETS
- 14 HERE.

15

16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: UNTIL TOMORROW?

17

18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO. UNTIL CAROL GUENTHER GETS HERE.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THERE WAS A SECOND TO IT, SO IT CAN --
- 21 IT'LL BE -- WE'LL JUST PUT IT ON THE LIST.

22

23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHO SECONDED IT?

24

25 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WAS THERE A SECOND?



1

2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WE'LL PUT IT OVER 'TIL SHE COMES.

3

4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WAS THERE A SECOND? I DIDN'T HEAR A SECOND.

5

- 6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WELL IF THE SECOND IS GOING TO DEPEND UPON
- 7 YOUR QUESTION TO MICHELLE.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL IF THERE'S NO SECOND, WE DON'T HAVE TO
- 10 ANSWER THE QUESTION.

11

- 12 SUP. KNABE: WELL I'LL SECOND IT TO LISTEN TO CAROL THOUGH, IF
- 13 THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE ASKING.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I JUST WANT TO SMOKE YOU OUT, THAT'S ALL,
- 16 THE TAX AND SPEND REPUBLICANS, THAT'S A -- OKAY CAROL IS HERE,
- 17 CAROL IS HERE.

18

19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT CAROL IS HERE.

20

- 21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT. CAROL, WE HAVE SET -- THE C.A.O.
- 22 HAS SET ASIDE \$4.4 MILLION TO PROVIDE TRAUMA IN THE THREE
- 23 AREAS WHERE WE HAVE HOLES IN OUR SYSTEM.

24

25 CAROL GUENTHER: OH NO TRAUMA HOSPITAL, RIGHT.



1
2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ANTELOPE VALLEY, SAN GABRIEL, CENTRAL SAN

3 GABRIEL VALLEY, AND POMONA VALLEY. RIGHT?

4

5 CAROL GUENTHER: RIGHT, RIGHT.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT IS THE STATUS OF, WHAT ARE YOU -- THE
- 8 QUESTION THAT I ASKED IS, HOW IS THAT MONEY GOING TO BE
- 9 APPROPRIATED.

10

- 11 CAROL GUENTHER: RIGHT. WE HAVE MET WITH ALL THREE OF THE
- 12 HOSPITALS THAT POTENTIALLY COULD BECOME TRAUMA CENTERS:
- 13 ANTELOPE VALLEY, POMONA VALLEY, AND QUEEN OF THE VALLEY. AND
- 14 NONE OF THEM HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY ARE ANYWHERE NEAR
- 15 BECOMING A TRAUMA CENTER. THEIR MAJOR ISSUE IS LACK OF
- 16 PHYSICIAN SUPPORT AND LACK OF PHYSICIAN COMMITMENT. NOT EVEN
- 17 SO MUCH FUNDING AS MUCH AS JUST IT TAKES A HUGE PHYSICIAN
- 18 COMMITMENT IN ORDER TO BECOME A TRAUMA CENTER. SO AS SUCH, I
- 19 HAVE TALKED WITH CHIEF FREEMAN'S STAFF ABOUT UTILIZING SOME OF
- 20 THOSE FUNDS TO GET A DEDICATED HELICOPTER IN THE ANTELOPE
- 21 VALLEY, WHICH YOU DO NOT CURRENTLY HAVE AT THIS TIME.

22

23 CHIEF FREEMAN: THAT'S CORRECT.



- 1 CAROL GUENTHER: AND IN ADDITION TO THAT, THEN, TO FUND THE
- 2 FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR EACH HELICOPTER RUN THAT IS NOT OTHERWISE
- 3 FUNDED THROUGH INSURANCE OR WHATEVER, AND UTILIZING THOSE
- 4 FUNDS, THEN, FOR HELICOPTER SERVICE UNTIL SUCH TIME AS WE MAY
- 5 GET A HOSPITAL TO COME INTO THE SYSTEM. IF WE GET A HOSPITAL
- 6 TO COME INTO THE SYSTEM, THEN WE WOULD NO LONGER NEED THE
- 7 HELICOPTER SERVICE AND THE MONEY WOULD DIVERT OVER TO THE
- 8 HOSPITAL.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: HOW ABOUT OTHER COMPANIES OTHER THAN THE
- 11 FIRE DEPARTMENT, WHICH COULD PROVIDE THE HELICOPTER SERVICE?
- 12 HAVE YOU TALKED TO ANY OF THEM?

13

- 14 CAROL GUENTHER: I HAVE PROPOSED THAT WE TAKE A LOOK AT FUNDING
- 15 THE OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES AND WE CERTAINLY COULD LOOK AT ANY
- 16 PRIVATE AGENCIES THAT MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO IT AS WELL.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THERE ARE PRIVATE AGENCIES THAT DO IT RIGHT
- 19 NOW, DON'T THEY?

20

- 21 CAROL GUENTHER: YES, YES, AS BACKUP, AS BACKUP WHEN COUNTY
- 22 FIRE DOES NOT CALL THEM -- DOES CALL THEM IN.

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHEN DO YOU EXPECT TO HAVE A PLAN OF ACTION
- 25 BACK TO THE BOARD?



1

- 2 CAROL GUENTHER: WE TALKED ABOUT IT LAST WEEK. I TALKED WITH
- 3 ERICK WEBBER OF YOUR STAFF LAST WEEK, AND I SAID THAT WITHIN
- 4 TWO WEEKS, WE COULD PROBABLY HAVE SOMETHING -- I TALKED WITH
- 5 DR. GARTHWAITE ABOUT IT LAST WEEK.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THEN WHY DON'T WE -- MIKE, WHY DON'T YOU
- 8 TAKE THIS OFF CALENDAR, PUT IT OVER. I'D RATHER LET THEM DO IT
- 9 IN THEIR OWN WAY AND THEN SEE WHAT THEIR RESULT IS, AND IF
- 10 YOU'RE NOT SATISFIED AT THAT POINT, THEN YOU CAN BRING THIS
- 11 BACK IN. I THINK THAT'S --

12

13 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THAT'D BE FINE.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY.

16

17 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WE'LL JUST CONTINUE THAT THEN.

18

19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY.

20

- 21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL WHY DON'T YOU REFER IT BACK TO YOUR
- 22 OFFICE FOR NOW AND THEN YOU CAN BRING IT BACK.

23

24 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I'LL JUST REINTRODUCE IT.



SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY, THANK YOU. 2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY. 3 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. SO YOU'LL DELETE THAT ONE. 6 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WE'RE GOING TO REINTRODUCE IT AT A BOARD 8 MEETING. 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. OKAY. 10 11 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THAT'S IT, MADAM. 12 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, OKAY, WE NOW HAVE -- WE'LL BE 14 GETTING A PRINTOUT THEN IN A FEW MINUTES. IS THE DEPARTMENT OF 15 16 CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES HERE? IS A REPRESENTATIVE FROM CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES HERE? ALL RIGHT. WOULD HE COME 17 18 FORWARD. 19 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MADAM CHAIR, CAN I INTRODUCE ONE MORE 21 MOTION? 22

24

23

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THIS IS IN RESPONSE TO SUPERVISOR MOLINA'S
- 2 REQUEST, AND THIS WOULD BE GENERIC TO ALL APPROPRIATIONS. IT
- 3 IS FACED WITH UNCERTAINTIES IN THE STATE BUDGET, THE COUNTY
- 4 SHOULD APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL FUNDS WITH CAUTION. I THEREFORE
- 5 MOVE THAT ALL ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY MOTION TODAY
- 6 BE FROZEN BY THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER BEGINNING OCTOBER 1ST,
- 7 2003, UNLESS OTHERWISE DETERMINED BY ACTIONS OF THIS BOARD.

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THEY BE WHAT?

10

8

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: FROZEN, FROZEN BY THE AUDITOR BEGINNING
- 12 OCTOBER 1ST, UNLESS OTHERWISE DETERMINED BY ACTIONS OF THIS
- 13 BOARD. IN OTHER WORDS, BETWEEN NOW AND OCTOBER 1ST, WE'LL HAVE
- 14 AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE WHAT THE BUDGET IS.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL, SHOULDN'T IT BE THE OPPOSITE, THAT ON
- 17 OCTOBER 1ST, THAT WE SHOULD WE -- THAT THEY WOULD BE FROZEN IF
- 18 -- UPON SOME REPORT FROM THE C.A.O. RATHER THAN THEM ALL BEING
- 19 -- THAT IT WOULD BE -- THAT THEY WOULD GO UNLESS THERE'S A
- 20 FINANCIAL IMPOSSIBILITY?

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL, I WANTED TO DO IT THIS WAY BECAUSE IT
- 23 ENSURES THAT IT'LL BE -- WE'LL DISCUSS IT BEFORE OCTOBER 1ST,
- 24 AND AT LEAST HAVE -- IF WE DON'T, IT'LL JUST BE A --



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HOW MANY VOTES DOES THAT TAKE THEN TO BE
- 2 ONE OF THESE?

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT WOULD TAKE THREE, IT WOULD STILL TAKE
- 5 THREE.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE'D HAVE TO VOTE ON EACH ONE OF THESE
- 8 AGAIN THOUGH RIGHT?

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YES, BUT IT WOULD ONLY BE A 3-VOTE ITEM AT
- 11 THAT POINT.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: I WANT TO UNDERSTAND SOMETHING THOUGH, 'CAUSE
- 14 THAT POINT IS IMPORTANT. IS THE THREE VOTE ITEM TO UNDO THIS,
- 15 BUT YOU DON'T REALLOCATE AFTER THIS, IS THAT CORRECT?

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO. IT'S ALLOCATED TODAY. AND ALL THIS IS A
- 18 -- IT'S ALMOST LIKE A RESOLUTION TO UNFREEZE. I DON'T THINK
- 19 IT'LL BE A PROBLEM, BUT I DO THINK IT PUTS THE ONUS ON THEM.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SO THAT WE WOULD PUT -- HAVE THE MOTION ON
- 22 NOVEMBER --

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO. BEFORE OCTOBER. PROBABLY LATE AUGUST,
- 25 SEPTEMBER, WHEN WE FIND OUT WHAT THE BUDGET IS OR WHENEVER,



- 1 YEAH SOMETIME BEFORE OCTOBER. WE'D HAVE TO DO IT BEFORE
- 2 OCTOBER. THE SOONER THE BETTER BUT ASSUMING WE KNOW SOMETHING
- 3 ON THAT.

4

5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T THINK IT'S A PROBLEM. IF THERE ARE
- 8 THREE VOTES TO DO IT TODAY, THERE'LL BE THREE VOTES TO DO IT
- 9 THEN, UNLESS THERE'S SOME CALAMITY, AND THEN I THINK THAT'S
- 10 WHAT THIS IS DESIGNED TO PROTECT AGAINST, A CALAMITY, WHICH WE
- 11 VERY WELL MAY HAVE.

12

13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

14

15 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** IS THERE A SECOND ON THIS ONE?

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND ON THIS?

18

19 SUP. MOLINA: SECONDED.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, SECONDED. IT'S ON THE LISTS. ALL
- 22 RIGHT. YOU HAD QUESTIONS ON CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES.

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DO. IS THIS THE TIME TO DO THAT?



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES.

2

3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH. OKAY.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THIS DOESN'T RELATE TO ITEM 4; THIS RELATES
- 6 TO ITEM 3.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY. MR. SANDERS IS HERE, AND IN A WAY,
- 9 IT'S -- YOU'RE NOT THE PERSON WHO REALLY NEEDS TO BE PUT ON
- 10 THE SPOT. I DON'T KNOW WHO, I THINK THIS MAY BE MORE OF A
- 11 C.A.O. ISSUE THAN IT IS YOUR ISSUE, BUT WHOSE EVER ISSUE IT
- 12 IS, I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND, FIRST OF ALL, WHAT IS THE
- 13 INCREASE THAT WE -- WHAT WAS THIS FISCAL YEAR, AND WHAT IS
- 14 NEXT -- THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR, THE PROPOSAL THAT THE C.A.O. IS
- 15 MAKING IS TO SPEND \$48 MILLION ON THE FOSTER CARE -- AN
- 16 ADDITIONAL 48 MILLION ON THE FOSTER CARE PROGRAM. IS THAT
- 17 CORRECT? OF NET COUNTY COST?

18

- 19 DR. DAVID SANDERS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY, I'M GOING TO HAVE
- 20 JOHN OPPENHEIM ANSWER THIS SPECIFIC QUESTION.

21

22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY THAT'S FINE. MR. OPPENHEIM?



- 1 JOHN OPPENHEIM: YES SUPERVISOR. THE PROPOSAL IS FOR ABOUT 86
- 2 MILLION TOTAL IN NET COUNTY COST, WHICH DOES REFLECT ABOUT A
- 3 \$48 MILLION INCREASE OVER THE CURRENT YEAR.

4

5 SUP. MOLINA: JOHN, PUT THE MICROPHONE CLOSER TO YOU.

6

7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SAY THAT AGAIN OKAY.

8

9 SUP. MOLINA: YEAH. I CAN'T HEAR YOU WELL.

10

- 11 JOHN OPPENHEIM: SORRY. THE TOTAL NET COUNTY COST ANTICIPATED
- 12 IN THE BUDGET YEAR FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE IS
- 13 86 MILLION, WHICH REPRESENTS AN INCREASE IN NET COUNTY COST OF
- 14 APPROXIMATELY 48 MILLION.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT. SO YOU WERE AT 38 LAST YEAR,
- 17 YOU'RE GOING TO BE AT 86 THIS YEAR FOR AN INCREASE OF 48
- 18 MILLION. RIGHT?

19

- 20 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT. THAT WAS BUDGETED. WHAT WE
- 21 PROBABLY ACTUALLY SPENT WAS ABOUT 38 MILLION OVER THE BUDGETED
- 22 AMOUNT. SO IT'S --

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO IT'S A HUNDRED PERCENT.



- 1 JOHN OPPENHEIM: REALLY AN INCREASE OF ONLY ABOUT 12 MILLION
- 2 COMPARED TO ACTUAL EXPENDITURE FOR THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

3

4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT DO YOU MEAN?

5

- 6 JOHN OPPENHEIM: WELL WE WILL OVERSPEND THE CURRENT FISCAL
- 7 YEAR'S ASSISTANCE NET COUNTY COST BY APPROXIMATELY 38 MILLION.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHICH IS EXACTLY DOUBLE WHAT YOU SPENT THIS
- 10 YEAR. IS THAT CORRECT? I MEAN, YOU SAID YOU WERE AT 38 MILLION
- 11 THIS YEAR, IT WAS GOING TO INCREASE BY --

12

- 13 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO. WE'RE 38 MILLION OVER THE BUDGETED AMOUNT
- 14 FOR THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO YOU'VE OVERSPENT BY 38 MILLION IN THIS
- 17 FISCAL YEAR?

18

19 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT, SUPERVISOR.

20

21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND NEXT -- AND SO WHAT IS THE 48 MILLION?

- 23 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THE 48 MILLION REPRESENTS APPROXIMATELY AN \$11
- 24 MILLION INCREASE OVER THE CURRENT YEAR, BUT A \$48 MILLION OVER
- 25 CURRENT YEAR BUDGETED.



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU KNOW, I'M HAVING TROUBLE FOLLOWING THIS 2 3 AND --4 5 SUP. MOLINA: IT'S FUNNY MATH. 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND MAYBE IT'S JUST THAT I'M NOT USED TO THE 7 8 DEFINITIONS. LET'S START -- FIRST OF ALL, COULD WE HAVE IT 9 QUIET IN THE ROOM? MAYBE THAT'S PART OF THE PROBLEM. NUMBER 10 ONE, THIS IS FOSTER CARE. RIGHT? 11 12 JOHN OPPENHEIM: FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE YES. 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: COULD WE ASK EVERYONE OVER IN THE CORNER, 14 COULD YOU STEP OUT. I THINK THEY'RE WORKING ON THE SHERIFF 15 16 ISSUE, I'M SORRY, THE FIRE DEPARTMENT ISSUE, COULD YOU MOVE AROUND THE CORNER. 17 18 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE FOSTER CARE 20 BUDGET HERE? 21 22 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT, FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION 23 ASSISTANCE.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IN FISCAL YEAR '02/'03, THE ONE WE ARE
- 2 CURRENTLY IN AND ABOUT TO WRAP UP, WHAT WAS THE BUDGET FOR
- 3 FOSTER CARE, NET COUNTY COST BUDGET FOR FOSTER CARE?

4

5 **JOHN OPPENHEIM:** 49 MILLION.

6

7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND YOU HAVE OVERSPENT THAT BY 38 MILLION?

8

9 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO FISCAL YEAR '02/'03, THE ONE THAT ENDS
- 12 NEXT WEEK, YOU WILL HAVE SPENT \$87 MILLION.

13

14 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THE 48 MILLION THAT JANSSEN HAS IN HIS
- 17 BUDGET TO SUPPLEMENT IS TO SUPPLEMENT WHAT?

18

- 19 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT RECOGNIZES THE ACTUAL EXPENDITURE FOR THE
- 20 CURRENT FISCAL YEAR PLUS ANTICIPATES AN ADDITIONAL \$11 MILLION
- 21 EXPENDITURE IN THE BUDGET YEAR.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THE 11 MILLION BEING THE INCREMENT BETWEEN
- 24 38 AND 48, WHICH IS REALLY 10 MILLION, BUT I ASSUME IT'S
- 25 SOMEWHERE IN THERE.

24

25

SOCIAL SERVICES.

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 2 JOHN OPPENHEIM: SOME ROUNDING, YES. 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY. NOW, SO THE INCREASE HAS TAKEN PLACE 4 5 OVER BOTH FISCAL YEARS. 6 7 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT. 8 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: A PIECE OF IT IN THIS --WELL MOST OF IT IN THIS FISCAL YEAR PLUS A LITTLE -- ANOTHER 11 MILLION NEXT 10 11 FISCAL YEAR THAT HE'S ANTICIPATING. AND THAT TOTAL IS 48 MILLION OVER WHAT -- SO IT'S ABOUT DOUBLE. RIGHT? 12 13 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT. 14 15 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY IS THE NET COUNTY COST FOR THIS PROGRAM DOUBLING IN ONE YEAR? 17 18 19 JOHN OPPENHEIM: ONE OF THE FACTORS IS THAT REALIGNMENT REVENUE THAT COMES INTO THE SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST FUND CAN -- THE 20 COUNTY HAS THE FLEXIBILITY TO ASSIGN IT TO ANY OF THE PROGRAMS 21 22 IN THERE OVER A TWO-YEAR PERIOD, APPROXIMATELY \$32 MILLION OF 23 REALIGNMENT REVENUE HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED TO COVER I.H.S.S.,

IN-HOME SUPPORT SERVICE, GROWTH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC



2 SUP. MOLINA: I KNOW HE LOST ME TOO.

3

1

4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: CAN THE C.A.O. CLARIFY THAT?

5

6 SUP. MOLINA: I FOLLOWED YOU FOR A WHILE THERE.

7

- 8 SUP. KNABE: WELL WHAT I'M CONFUSED ABOUT, IN OTHER WORDS I
- 9 THINK THAT THE COST THAT YOU'VE OVER-SPENDED, YOU'RE JUST
- 10 TAKING THAT AS AN AUTOMATIC FOR NEXT YEAR AS A BASE RATE. AND
- 11 IS THAT'S WHY YOU'RE SAYING THE EXPENDITURE'S ONLY 12 --

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL PLUS 11.

14

- 15 SUP. KNABE: WELL THEY SAID IF THAT'S WHY THEY'RE SAYING THE
- 16 EXPENDITURE'S ONLY 11 MILLION WHEN IT REALLY IS 48, IS THAT
- 17 CORRECT, I MEAN I'M CONFUSED?

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: COULD THE C.A.O. EXPLAIN IT FOR US? AND
- 20 ALSO, HIS STATEMENT IN TERMS OF REALIGNMENT. DID THEY LOSE
- 21 THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY?

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SUPERVISOR, ON THE -- WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
- 24 FIND OUT ON THE DETAILS. IT IS TRUE THAT WE WERE MOVING NET
- 25 COUNTY COST OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS BETWEEN I.H.S.S. AND



- 1 CHILDREN'S SERVICES BECAUSE A NUMBER OF YEARS, IT WAS GIVING
- 2 THE FALSE IMPRESSION THAT ONE OF THE PROGRAMS WAS NOT COSTING
- 3 THE COUNTY AS MUCH AS IT REALLY WAS, JUST BY HOW WE ASSIGNED
- 4 THE REVENUE OF REALIGNMENT, AND THAT'S ONE PART OF THAT. I
- 5 DON'T KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THAT 38 MILLION PART OF IT IS
- 6 ASSOCIATED WITH THAT. THERE ARE TWO THINGS HAPPENING THAT I
- 7 THINK JOHN CAN TALK ABOUT THAT WE DO KNOW ARE CAUSING THE
- 8 PROBLEM. ONE, THE "F" MAP FORMULA WAS CHANGED, FEDERAL
- 9 FORMULA, FROM 51.4% TO 50%, SO WE LOST FEDERAL REVENUE, AND I
- 10 DON'T HAVE THE DOLLAR. DO YOU HAVE THE DOLLAR, JOHN, ON THAT?

12 JOHN OPPENHEIM: I DON'T KNOW THE EXACT DOLLAR. BUT IN ADDITION

- 13 TO THAT, THERE WAS ABOUT A 20% SWING IN THE PERCENTAGE OF
- 14 CASES THAT WERE FEDERALLY ELIGIBLE VERSUS NON-FEDERALLY
- 15 ELIGIBLE, IN PART DUE TO WHAT THEY CALL THE 'LOOK BACK,' THAT
- 16 IN THE WELFARE REFORM ACT --

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 1996.

- 20 JOHN OPPENHEIM: WE HAVE TO DETERMINE FEDERAL ELIGIBILITY ON
- 21 FAMILIES THAT CHILDREN ARE REMOVED FROM BASED ON THE STANDARDS
- 22 THAT WERE IN EFFECT ON JULY 16TH, 1996, AND WE'RE NOW SOME
- 23 SEVEN YEARS LATER.

24

11

17



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SO A PORTION -- WE HAVE KIDS THAT ARE NO
- 2 LONGER ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL MONEYS AS A RESULT OF THE WELFARE
- 3 REFORM. SO YOU HAVE BOTH OF THOSE FEDERAL ADJUSTMENTS
- 4 IMPACTING THE BUDGET. NOW, WHAT WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO TELL YOU
- 5 IS EXACTLY WHAT THE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THAT IS, WHICH I ASSUME
- 6 MY STAFF CAN, IF I GET THE RIGHT STAFF, AND HOW THAT RELATES
- 7 TO REALIGNMENT ASSIGNMENT OF REVENUE. BUT THERE'S NO OUESTION
- 8 THAT -- AND THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS WE'RE INTERESTED IN
- 9 TALKING ABOUT BLOCK GRANT IN THIS PROGRAM, IS IT'S UNLIKE ANY
- 10 OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAM. THE FEDERAL REVENUES ARE DECREASING AS
- 11 A RESULT OF DECISIONS THAT THEY'VE MADE IN THE PAST.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AS A RESULT OF BLOCK GRANT DECISIONS THEY'RE
- 14 MAKING.

15

16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, WELFARE REFORM --

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL IT'S ALL THE SAME CONCEPT, WHETHER YOU
- 19 CALL IT BLOCK GRANT OR ANYTHING ELSE.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DOES IT RELATE TO THE FIVE-YEAR AT ALL, OR
- 22 WHAT? WHAT DOES IT RELATE TO?

- 24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT RELATES TO THE THRESHOLD, THE DOLLAR
- 25 THRESHOLD RIGHT INCOME.



1

- 2 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S CORRECT, YOU KNOW, YOU HAD TO HAVE,
- 3 SAY, IN ROUND FIGURES, \$700 OF INCOME FOR A FAMILY OF FOUR TO
- 4 BE ELIGIBLE IN '96, AND TODAY, IF YOU WERE APPLYING FOR
- 5 CALWORKS, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE SLIGHTLY OVER \$800 SO.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT MY POINT ORIGINALLY IS, AND I JUST WANT
- 8 TO BE CLEAR I'M NOT OVERREACHING HERE, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME, AND
- 9 I'D LIKE TO GET THIS QUANTIFIED AS TO HOW MUCH, BUT IT SEEMS
- 10 TO ME THAT THE FEDERAL DECISIONS, THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION'S
- 11 DECISIONS ON HOW TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR FOSTER CARE,
- 12 BASICALLY DIMINISHING THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S AVAILABLE FOR
- 13 THAT PURPOSE, IS FORCING US TO USE LOCAL MONEY, PROPERTY
- 14 TAXPAYER MONEY, TO BACKFILL. IS THAT CORRECT?

15

16 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S ABSOLUTELY CORRECT.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND IS THAT -- DOES THAT ACCOUNT FOR A
- 19 HUNDRED PERCENT OF THIS 48 MILLION ADDITIONAL, OR 90%? WHAT IS
- 20 IT?

- 22 **JOHN OPPENHEIM:** NO. ABOUT 4 MILLION IS INCREASED NET COUNTY
- 23 COST BECAUSE OF THE GROWING ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.
- 24 ADOPTIONS IS OBVIOUSLY A VERY POSITIVE THING FOR CHILDREN, BUT
- 25 ONCE ADOPTED, THOSE FAMILIES CONTINUE TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR



- 1 ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS UNTIL THE CHILD TURNS 18. THERE'S BEEN
- 2 SOME INCREASE OF ABOUT A MILLION DOLLARS NET COUNTY COST IN
- 3 SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN THAT BY STATE LAW
- 4 WE'RE RESPONSIBLE FOR, AND SOME INCREASE IN THE KINGAP
- 5 PROGRAM. FAMILIES HAVE THE OPTION AFTER 12 MONTHS OF GETTING
- 6 OUT OF THE DEPENDENCY SYSTEM AND RECEIVING A FOSTER CARE
- 7 PAYMENT CALLED KINGAP PAYMENTS. AND THAT CASELOAD, AGAIN,
- 8 THOSE FAMILIES ARE ELIGIBLE UNTIL THE CHILD TURNS 18, SO THAT
- 9 CASELOAD IS GROWING.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT SO THAT'S A MILLION DOLLARS, IS
- 12 THAT A -- IS THAT THE SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CATEGORY?

13

14 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO. THAT'S JUST REGULAR FOSTER CARE.

15

16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO HOW MUCH IS THAT?

17

18 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S ABOUT \$2 MILLION.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: ZEV, CAN I ASK A QUESTION?

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: HANG ON ONE SECOND. I JUST WANT HIM TO
- 23 FINISH THE LIST. SO IS THE BALANCE -- IS THE BALANCE --

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



- JOHN OPPENHEIM: THE BALANCE WOULD BE SOME COMBINATION OF THOSE 1 2 OTHER TWO FACTORS WHICH EQUAL ABOUT --3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: 48 MILLION. 4 5 JOHN OPPENHEIM: EXACTLY, THE TOTAL. 6 7 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO THIS -- YOU GAVE ME SEVEN. SO IT'S ABOUT \$40 MILLION, \$41 MILLION THAT'S -- THAT'S WHAT, JUST STRAIGHT 10 CUTS IN THE FORMULA FOR FOSTER CARE, FOR STRAIGHT FOSTER CARE? 11 JOHN OPPENHEIM: IT'S THAT, COMBINED WITH THE SHIFT OF 12 13 REALIGNMENT DOLLARS OUT OF FOSTER CARE AND INTO I.H.S.S. 14 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND HOW MUCH OF THAT IS THE REALIGNMENT 16 SHIFT? 17 18 JOHN OPPENHEIM: I THINK IT'S ABOUT 16 MILLION. 19 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT'S A STATE DECISION? 21 22 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S A COUNTY DECISION. 23 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: EXPLAIN THAT TO ME, HOW THE --
 - The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



- 1 JOHN OPPENHEIM: WE HAVE GROWTH BOTH IN FOSTER CARE AND IN
- 2 I.H.S.S., AND THE COUNTY HAS THE OPTION TO ASSIGN THE DOLLARS
- 3 THAT COME INTO THE SOCIAL SERVICES TRUST FUND TO ANY PROGRAM
- 4 ELIGIBLE WITHIN THAT FUND.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO THE 16 MILLION IN REALIGNMENT HAS GONE
- 7 FROM WHERE TO WHERE?

8

- 9 JOHN OPPENHEIM: IT WENT FROM BEING ASSIGNED TO CHILD WELFARE
- 10 FOR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO BEING ASSIGNED TO COVER I.H.S.S.
- 11 COSTS, WHICH THEN DROVE UP BY AN EQUAL AMOUNT THE EXPENDITURES
- 12 IN FOSTER CARE ASSISTANCE BUDGET THAT NEED TO BE COVERED WITH
- 13 NET COUNTY COSTS.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT THAT'S ALSO DRIVEN BY THE STATE'S
- 16 OVERALL I.H.S.S. POLICY, WHICH HAS DRIVEN UP THE COSTS OF OUR
- 17 OWN DECISIONS HERE.

18

- 19 JOHN OPPENHEIM: ABSOLUTELY. THE SHIFTING OF THE MONEY IS OUR
- 20 DECISION. THE COST INCREASE ARE PRIMARILY AS A RESULT OF STATE
- 21 LAW AND POLICY CHANGES.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO THE FEDERAL PORTION -- JUST A LAST
- 24 QUESTION ON THIS. OF THE 48 MILLION, HOW MUCH OF THE 48



- 1 MILLION IS AS A RESULT OF FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY DECISION
- 2 MAKING? IS IT 48 MINUS 16?

3

4 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO I'D SAY IT'S 48 MINUS 24.

5

6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO ABOUT HALF OF IT, ALL RIGHT.

7

- 8 SUP. MOLINA: I JUST NEED A CLARIFICATION, BECAUSE THERE'S SOME
- 9 -- JUST LIKE MR. YAROSLAVSKY, I'M A BIT CONFUSED ON THIS. SO
- 10 WHEN YOU OVERSPENT THE BUDGET BY \$38 MILLION, WHERE DID THAT
- 11 MONEY COME FROM?

12

13 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NET COUNTY COST.

14

15 SUP. MOLINA: SO --

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT CAME OUT OF EXISTING SURPLUSES AND CURRENT-
- 18 YEAR OPERATIONS.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: IT CAME OUT WITHIN THE BUDGET.

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WITHIN THE COUNTY BUDGET, NOT WITHIN THEIR
- 23 BUDGET.

24

25 SUP. MOLINA: NOT -- WITHIN OUR COUNTY BUDGET.



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT. WHEN WE BUDGETED, OH GO AHEAD, FINISH
- 3 YOUR THOUGHT.

4

- 5 SUP. MOLINA: SO THAT'S THE ANSWER. SO WE WERE PAYING FOR IT
- 6 ANYWAY.

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: EVEN THOUGH WE DIDN'T BUDGET FOR IT.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. WHEN WE PUT TOGETHER THE BUDGET LAST
- 13 YEAR, WE DID NOT ACCOUNT FOR OR ANTICIPATE, CORRECT ME IF I'M
- 14 WRONG, THAT THE F-MAP CHANGE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DID
- 15 WOULD COST US \$26.9 MILLION -- \$27 MILLION, THAT WAS NOT
- 16 INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET.

17

18 **SUP. MOLINA:** FROM 51.4% TO 50% THAT 1 AND --

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: \$27 MILLION.

21

22 SUP. MOLINA: HOW MUCH?

23

24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: \$27 MILLION, OF FEDERAL MONEY THAT WE LOST.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: YOU UNDERSTAND THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE WHEN YOU
- 2 KEEP SAYING THE NUMBER BACK TO ME.

3

4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH.

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: FROM 50% -- FROM 51.4%, IT CHANGED TO 50%. 1.4%
- 7 DIFFERENCE, AND YOU'RE SAYING IT MEANS \$27 MILLION, WHEN THE
- 8 ONLY -- THE TOTAL AMOUNT THAT YOU WERE GETTING WAS 49 MILL.

9

10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT.

11

12 SUP. MOLINA: THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE, DAVID.

13

14 SUP. KNABE: I THOUGHT HE SAID IT WAS A 20% REDUCTION.

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE TOTAL AMOUNT THAT WE WERE -- WELL, CAN I
- 17 SUGGEST THIS? BECAUSE I THINK WE'RE NOT -- WE'RE NOT TRACKING
- 18 WITH THE DEPARTMENT ON THE HANDLING OF REALIGNMENT.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. WELL, FIRST OF ALL --

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK WE NEED TO WORK AND GET NUMBERS
- 23 STRAIGHT.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: I UNDERSTAND, AND I WOULD APPRECIATE GETTING
- 2 THOSE NUMBERS STRAIGHT. THAT'S ONE ISSUE. AND THEN THE OTHER
- 3 ISSUE ON THIS ALLOCATION, THE PROBLEM THAT I'M TROUBLED WITH,
- 4 AND WE WENT THROUGH THIS OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN MY DEALINGS
- 5 WITH MARGE LAST YEAR, THAT WE WERE SUPPOSEDLY LEAVING FOSTER
- 6 CARE MONEY ON THE TABLE. YOU DON'T REMEMBER MAKING THAT
- 7 STATEMENT?

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: DRAWING DOWN STATE MONEY YOU MEAN? ADDITIONAL
- 10 STATE FUNDS?

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: AND FEDERAL DOLLARS, THAT THIS COUNTY WAS ONE OF
- 13 THE FEW COUNTIES THAT WAS LEAVING DOLLARS AT THE TABLE. IS
- 14 THIS UNFAMILIAR TO YOU, JOHN?

15

16 JOHN OPPENHEIM: YES, IT DOES, AND THERE --

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: IT'S UNFAMILIAR TO YOU OR IT'S FAMILIAR?

19

20 JOHN OPPENHEIM: IT'S FAMILIAR TO ME, YES.

21

22 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY. EXPLAIN TO ME WHY.

- 24 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THESE WERE ADMINISTRATIVE DOLLARS. THE STATE
- 25 GAVE US AN AUGMENTATION ALLOCATION. YOU HAD TO SPEND ALL OF



- 1 YOUR BASE ALLOCATION, WHICH MATCHES COUNTY AND FEDERAL
- 2 DOLLARS, AND THEN THEY GAVE AN AUGMENTATION AMOUNT OVER AND
- 3 ABOVE THAT THAT DIDN'T REQUIRE AN ADDITIONAL COUNTY MATCH BUT
- 4 COULD BE USED AS A MATCH TO FEDERAL DOLLARS. I BELIEVE IN THE
- 5 END OF THE '01 FISCAL YEAR, THE COUNTY RETURNED ABOUT \$21
- 6 MILLION IN STATE GENERAL FUND AUGMENTATION DOLLARS AND IN THE
- 7 '02 FISCAL YEAR, IT'S PROBABLY DOWN TO ABOUT \$4 MILLION THAT -
- 8 OF AUGMENTATION MONEY THAT WE DIDN'T -- THAT WE DIDN'T DRAW
- 9 DOWN, WHICH PROBABLY EQUATES TO APPROXIMATELY \$7.5 MILLION IN
- 10 PURCHASING POWER. BUT THAT'S ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE SIDE, NOT
- 11 ON THE ASSISTANCE SIDE.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: BUT SO THAT IS THE MONEY THAT MARGE WAS TALKING
- 14 ABOUT WHEN SHE SAID WE WERE LEAVING FOSTER CARE MONEY ON THE
- 15 TABLE.

16

- 17 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THOSE ARE THE DOLLARS THAT SHE WAS TALKING
- 18 ABOUT.

19

- 20 SUP. MOLINA: SO WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT ADDITIONAL AID DOLLARS
- 21 THAT WE WERE NOT IMPLEMENTING HERE.

22

- 23 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO, THAT'S CORRECT. IT WAS ADMINISTRATIVE
- 24 MONEY.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: SO IN THESE CUTS THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS
- 2 MADE ON THIS GOING TO A 50%, IS THIS PART OF FEDERAL BUDGETING
- 3 PROCESSES OR A CHANGING OF FORMULA THAT AFFECTS ONLY OUR
- 4 COUNTY?

5

- 6 JOHN OPPENHEIM: IT'S A CHANGING IN FORMULA THAT AFFECT THE
- 7 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. IT'S CALLED THE F-MAP -- THE F-MAP RATE,
- 8 THE FEDERAL MEDICAID ASSISTANCE PAYMENT LEVEL, AND IF
- 9 FLUCTUATES BASED ON A NUMBER OF FACTORS AND TYPICALLY GETS
- 10 CHANGED OCTOBER 1ST AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FEDERAL FISCAL
- 11 YEAR, AND THIS PAST OCTOBER, IT DROPPED BY THE 1.4%.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: AND SO IT COULD EVEN DROP FURTHER AGAIN,
- 14 DEPENDING ON WHAT THE --

15

16 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO, IT WON'T GO BELOW 50%.

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: IT CANNOT GO.

19

20 JOHN OPPENHEIM: BY POLICY IT WON'T GO BELOW 50%.

- 22 SUP. MOLINA: AND DAVID MY FINAL QUESTION WITH REGARD TO THIS
- 23 ISSUE IS ONE OF THE COMMITMENTS THAT WE MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT
- 24 OF CHILDREN SERVICES WITH MACLAREN MONEY, WHICH IS N.C.C. THAT



- 1 IS BEING PUT AWAY AND SET ASIDE FOR THE UTILIZATION OF THIS
- 2 DEPARTMENT?

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. WE STILL HAVE, IN P.F.U., 9.5 MILLION
- 5 DOLLARS TO ASSIGN TO THE DEPARTMENT.

6

7 SUP. MOLINA: BUT AGAIN, WE HAVE MUCH MORE THAN THAT.

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 1 MILLION WENT TO THE ASSISTANCE TO HANDLE THE
- 10 PART THAT WASN'T --

11

12 SUP. MOLINA: BUT WE HAVE MUCH MORE THAN THAT, HOW MUCH OF IT?

13

- 14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT WAS -- THE REST OF IT WAS ALLOCATED TO THE
- 15 DEPARTMENT. IT IS STILL IN THEIR BUDGET. WE HAD 17 MILLION, IS
- 16 MY RECOLLECTION, SUPERVISOR.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: BUT THERE'S MUCH MORE OF THIS. MACLAREN COSTS
- 19 MILLIONS AND MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

20

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: BUT THE NET COUNTY COST WAS ALL THAT WE
- 22 COMMITTED. THAT \$17 MILLION OF GENERAL FUND --

23

24 SUP. MOLINA: ALL OF MACLAREN WAS NET COUNTY COST.



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO. NO THE MACLAREN BUDGET WAS --

2

3 JOHN OPPENHEIM: 40 MILLION.

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 50 MILLION. 40 TO 50 MILLION.

6

- 7 JOHN OPPENHEIM: 40 MILLION, ABOUT 18 MILLION WAS NET COUNTY
- 8 COST.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: HOW MUCH, HOW MUCH?

11

- 12 JOHN OPPENHEIM: 17.8 MILLION WAS BUDGETED IN THE CURRENT '03
- 13 FISCAL YEAR AS NET COUNTY COST FOR MACLAREN WITH I BELIEVE A
- 14 GROSS APPROPRIATION OF AROUND 41 MILLION.

15

- 16 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. SO THAT CONTINUES TO STAY WITHIN THAT
- 17 DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET.

18

19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, YES, WE COMMITTED TO THAT.

20

- 21 SUP. MOLINA: BUT DO YOU HAVE IT ALLOCATED WITHIN YOUR
- 22 DEPARTMENT AS YET?

- 24 JOHN OPPENHEIM: WE HAVE 8.3 MILLION OF IT ALLOCATED AND ABOUT
- 25 9.5 MILLION OF IT RESERVED.

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT AND AGAIN, THAT HOPEFULLY IS GOING TO 2 3 BE UTILIZED FOR THE SATELLITE CENTERS. CORRECT? 4 5 JOHN OPPENHEIM: ABSOLUTELY, THAT'S THE NUMBER ONE ON THE LIST. 6 7 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY, THANK YOU. 8 SUP. KNABE: MADAM CHAIR? I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION. 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SUPERVISOR KNABE. 11 12 SUP. KNABE: DAVID, THE ISSUE OF THE TRANSFER FROM FOSTER CARE 13 14 TO I.H.S.S., WHAT WAS THAT DONE FOR? WHY, I MEAN, WHY THE 15 SHIFT? 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE DID THAT A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, AND THAT'S 17 18 ONE OF THE THINGS WE WANT TO VERIFY. I DON'T THINK IT 19 INFLUENCES THESE PARTICULAR NUMBERS, BUT IT WAS JUST A MATTER OF WHERE YOU WERE SHOWING THE GENERAL FUND. AND IF I REMEMBER 20 21 THIS CORRECTLY, WE KEPT HAVING TYRONE COMING IN AND SAYING 22 THAT REALIGNMENT WAS PAYING FOR THE WHOLE PROGRAM. WELL, IT 23 ONLY PAID FOR THE PROGRAM BECAUSE WE PUT REALIGNMENT FUNDS THERE. IF WE HAD HAVE ALLOCATED THEM TO THE CASELOAD, MORE 24

SHOULD HAVE GONE TO CHILDREN SERVICES AND IT WOULD NOT HAVE



- 1 APPEARED THAT I.H.S.S. WAS BEING PAID FOR. SO NONE OF THIS
- 2 COST US ANY MORE MONEY, IT WAS JUST WHERE YOU PUT THE
- 3 REIMBURSEMENT.

4

- 5 SUP. KNABE: SO IT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE PAY RAISE ON THE
- 6 I.H.S.S. DEAL, THE AMOUNT'S PRETTY CLOSE.

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, NO, IT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT.
- 9 THERE'S A MOTION HERE I THINK FROM SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY
- 10 WHICH I, YOU KNOW, THINK WILL HELP A LOT, AND THAT'S ASKING US
- 11 TO COME BACK IN TWO WEEKS TO EXPLAIN IN BETTER DETAIL EXACTLY
- 12 WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THESE NUMBERS.

13

- 14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HOWEVER, ARE YOU MOVING, THOUGH, THAT WE
- 15 APPROVE THIS ITEM AND COME BACK, OR ARE YOU PUTTING THIS WHOLE
- 16 THING OVER? YOU'RE ASKING TO PUT IT WHOLE OVER.

17

18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL I --

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT DOESN'T MATTER, YOU CAN DO IT EITHER WAY.

21

22 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** HUH?



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IF YOU WANT TO HOLD THE 11 MILLION I THINK
- 2 THAT'S FINE, IT'S FOR THE FULL YEAR, SO WE'LL HAVE ENOUGH
- 3 MONEY TO COVER THAT.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL IT'S NOT JUST THE 11 MILLION, BUT IT'S
- 6 THE INCREASE IN THIS FISCAL --

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I THINK THE 48 MILLION WAS ALREADY INCLUDED
- 9 IN THE ONES WE ADOPTED EARLIER.

10

- 11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK MOST OF THE CURRENT YEAR INCREASE
- 12 DIDN'T RESULT FROM A HUGE GROWTH IN THE PROGRAM, THE PROGRAM
- 13 ISN'T GROWING.

14

15 JOHN OPPENHEIM: NO IT'S NOT.

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S JUST A MATTER OF WE DID NOT BUDGET
- 18 FEDERAL REVENUE OFFSET IN THE PROGRAM -- OR WE DID BUDGET
- 19 FEDERAL REVENUE TO OFFSET THE PROGRAM AND IT DIDN'T COME IN
- 20 WHEN THEY CHANGED F-MAP. 26.9 MILLION DOLLARS WE WERE SHORT
- 21 FROM WHAT WE ANTICIPATED, AND THAT'S THE PRIMARY JUMP FOR THE
- 22 CURRENT-YEAR GENERAL FUND COST.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO THE PROGRAM IS NOT GROWING, IT MAY BE
- 2 EVEN DIMINISHING SLIGHTLY, BUT THE COSTS WENT UP A HUNDRED
- 3 PERCENT.

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OUR COST.

6

7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OUR COST WENT UP A HUNDRED PERCENT.

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE COUNTY COST RIGHT. EXACTLY RIGHT, AND
- 10 BECAUSE OF F-MAP AND ALSO BECAUSE OF THE LOOK-BACK PROVISIONS
- 11 OF THE --OF WELFARE REFORM, AND THAT'S WHAT WE NEED TO DETAIL
- 12 FOR YOU.

13

- 14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY DON'T YOU JUST EXPLAIN IN LAYMAN'S
- 15 LANGUAGE WHAT F-MAP IS AND WHAT THE CHANGE REPRESENTS FOR THE
- 16 PEOPLE WATCHING AT HOME.

- 18 JOHN OPPENHEIM: F-MAP, I BELIEVE, STANDS FOR FEDERAL MEDICAID
- 19 ASSISTANCE PAYMENT LEVEL, AND IT'S CALCULATED ON A FORMULA, I
- 20 DON'T KNOW ALL OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE FORMULA, BUT IT'S
- 21 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, POVERTY, GENERAL MEASURES OF A STATE'S
- 22 ECONOMIC CONDITION, AND IT MAY VARY, IT COULD BE AS HIGH AS
- 23 70% IN SOME EXTREMELY POOR STATES, MISSISSIPPI OR WHEREVER,
- 24 AND DOESN'T GO BELOW 50% IN ANY STATE. SO IN LARGE MEASURE,
- 25 IT'S A PHENOMENA OF THE STRENGTH OF THE CALIFORNIA ECONOMY TWO



- 1 YEARS AGO, AND BECAUSE IT'S IN ARREARS, YOU KNOW, AS WE MOVE
- 2 FORWARD, THE WEAKNESS OF THE CALIFORNIA ECONOMY WILL AGAIN BE
- 3 REFLECTED IN THE FUTURE YEAR F-MAP RATES.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO IS THIS KIND OF AN AUTOMATIC THING? IT'S
- 6 NOT A POLICY CHANGE? IT'S JUST AN EXISTING FORMULA THAT --

7

- 8 JOHN OPPENHEIM: AN EXISTING FORMULA THAT YOU PLUG THE NUMBERS
- 9 IN AND IT PRODUCES THE RESULT.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND DO WE ANTICIPATE THESE CHANGES, IF
- 12 THEY'RE PREDICTABLE BASED ON CHANGES ON THE GROUND HERE IN
- 13 CALIFORNIA, DO WE -- WHY DIDN'T WE -- OR COULD WE HAVE
- 14 FACTORED THAT IN IN OUR BUDGETING LAST YEAR?

15

16 JOHN OPPENHEIM: I SUSPECT THAT WE COULD HAVE.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I'M NOT SURE.

19

- 20 JOHN OPPENHEIM: I'M NOT SURE THAT WE KNEW WHAT THE NUMBER WAS
- 21 AT THE TIME OF THE BUDGET.

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S SOMETHING WE'LL REPORT BACK IN THE TWO
- 24 WEEKS. THIS IS ALSO, YOU MAY REMEMBER WHEN WE WERE IN
- 25 WASHINGTON WHEN CONGRESS WAS TALKING ABOUT THE ALLOWANCE FOR



- 1 STATES. PART OF WHAT THEY DID WAS ADJUST BY STATUTE THE F-MAP
- 2 RATE. SO IT APPARENTLY IS A STATUTORY PROVISION. MY GUESS IS,
- 3 IS THAT IT HAS SO MANY VARIABLES IN IT THAT IT'S VERY HARD FOR
- 4 ANYBODY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL TO FIGURE OUT, BUT I THINK WE NEED
- 5 TO LOOK AT THAT AND REPORT BACK ON WHY WE DID NOT INCLUDE IT
- 6 IN THE BUDGET.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY DOES THE MEDICAID PROGRAM OR THE
- 9 MATCHING RATE AFFECT FOSTER CARE?

10

- 11 JOHN OPPENHEIM: THAT'S JUST THE WAY CONGRESS ESTABLISHED IT.
- 12 IN THIS RECENT ROUND OF STATUTORY ADJUSTMENTS, THEY EXCLUDED
- 13 FOSTER CARE FROM IT, SO WE DIDN'T GET THE BENEFIT THAT OTHER
- 14 DEPARTMENTS GOT WITH RESPECT TO MEDI-CAL PROGRAMS. JUST I
- 15 THINK PURELY THE DISCRETION OF CONGRESS IN CRAFTING THE
- 16 STATUTE.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S WHY WE DIDN'T GET ANY AFTER THAT --

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT --

21

22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T KNOW WHETHER --

23

24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YOU HAVE A MOTION THAT --



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH I HAVE MOTION AND I WON'T -- SINCE
- 2 DAVID READ IT I WON'T READ IT BUT I JUST -- I DON'T KNOW
- 3 WHETHER TO HOLD THE 11 MILLION.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HOW MUCH CHOICE DO WE HAVE ON THIS -- HOW
- 6 MUCH CHOICE DO WE HAVE IN TERMS OF --

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY DON'T WE HOLD THE 11 MILLION UNTIL YOU
- 9 COME BACK IN TWO WEEKS. IS THAT ALL RIGHT?

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S FINE.

12

13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: GET A REPORT IN TWO WEEKS.

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY.

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: JUST ON THE 11 MILLION PORTION OF THE 48.

20

21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY.

22

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WHICH WAS THE ADD-ON, ALL RIGHT SO ON --
- 24 WE'LL CONTINUE THAT PORTION OF ITEM 3. HMM?



SUP.MOLINA: THAT WASN'T APPROVED IN ITEM 3?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT WAS NOT.

4

5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WE HELD IT, WE HELD IT.

6

7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT WAS NOT APPROVED IN ITEM 3, THAT'S CORRECT.

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: EVERYTHING ELSE WAS APPROVED BUT THIS. SO
- 10 THIS ITEM -- THE CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES ITEM WILL GO
- 11 OVER FOR TWO WEEKS, AND THAT DOESN'T AFFECT THE NUMBER OF
- 12 VOTES ON IT. IT'S STILL THE 3-VOTE. ALL RIGHT. HMM?

13

14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I DON'T SEE A PROBLEM EITHER WAY.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WE HAVE THE ITEMS BEFORE
- 17 US. WE ALSO HAVE --

18

- 19 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I HAVE A COUPLE MORE ITEMS, BUT LET ME --
- 20 VIOLET DID NOT HEAR OUR SECOND FOR THE MOTION THAT SUPERVISOR
- 21 KNABE HAD MADE ON THE FAMILY VIOLENCE. I HAD SECONDED THAT
- 22 ONE, HE HAD INTRODUCED THAT.

23

24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S UNDER --



SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

2

3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S ITEM 8. RIGHT?

4

- 5 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THAT WAS DON'S MOTION. BUT I HAD TWO OTHER
- 6 PROBATION MOTIONS. ONE IS THAT THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT'S
- 7 PROPOSAL TO CUT 24 SCHOOL-BASED DEPUTY PROBATION OFFICERS.
- 8 THESE ARE VITAL DAILY OVERSIGHT OF YOUTHFUL PROBATIONERS
- 9 ENSURING THAT THEY ARE ATTENDING SCHOOL AND COMPLYING WITH THE
- 10 TERMS OF PROBATION AND MAINTAINING THEIR GRADES. AND I MOVE
- 11 THAT THE BOARD ALLOCATE THE \$1.1 MILLION BUDGET AUGMENTATION
- 12 FROM THE DESIGNATION FOR BUDGET UNCERTAINTIES FUNDS FOR THE
- 13 PROBATION DEPARTMENT.

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, THE -- FOR 24 SCHOOL BASED
- 16 DEPUTY PROBATION OFFICERS, IS THERE A SECOND TO THIS?

17

18 SUP. KNABE: SECOND.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THEN THIS WOULD BE -- DID YOU
- 21 HAVE ANOTHER ONE?

- 23 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE OTHER ONE DEALS WITH THE CLEAR PROGRAM
- 24 FOR THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY. THIS IS THE PROGRAM THAT TARGETS
- 25 AND PROSECUTES CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS, FUNDING HAS BEEN



- 1 APPROVED IN THIS PROGRAM IN 1998, SINCE THEN THE STATE HAS
- 2 ANNUALLY DECREASED THE ALLOCATION TO OUR COUNTY. FISCAL YEAR
- 3 2002/'03 THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ALLOCATION WAS CUT BY \$1
- 4 MILLION WITH THE LOSS OF SEVEN DEPUTY D.A.'S DEDICATED TO THE
- 5 VERTICAL PROSECUTION OF GANG CRIMES. I'D WOULD MOVE THAT THE
- 6 BOARD APPROVE THE \$1 MILLION BUDGET AUGMENTATION TO THE
- 7 DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR SEVEN D.A. POSITIONS WHICH
- 8 WOULD RESTORE THEIR CLEAR PROGRAM.

9

10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND? HEARING NO SECOND.

11

- 12 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE LAST ONE IS FOR THE CORONER'S OFFICE AND
- 13 THAT'S THE ISSUE THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED ABOUT THE FACT THAT THE
- 14 CORONER IS THE FIRST RESPONDER WHENEVER THERE'S A TERRORIST OR
- 15 BIOLOGICAL OR CHEMICAL ATTACK, AND WE'D MOVE THAT THE BOARD
- 16 APPROVE A \$103,000 AUGMENTATION TO THE CORONER'S OFFICE FOR
- 17 MANDATORY FIRST RESPONDER SAFETY EQUIPMENT TRAINING,
- 18 BIOHAZARD, CONTAINER TENTS, AUTOPSY, H.E.P.A. FILTRATION
- 19 SYSTEM, LABORATORY UPGRADE FROM BIOHAZARD LEVEL TWO TO THREE,
- 20 AND OTHER NECESSITIES FOR USE IN CASE OF A CHEMICAL OR
- 21 BIOLOGICAL ATTACK.

22

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND?

24

25 SUP. KNABE: SECOND.



1

2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THANK YOU.

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THERE'S A SECOND ON THIS ONE. THERE'S A
- 5 SECOND ON THIS ONE. ALL RIGHT NOW, DOES THAT CONCLUDE
- 6 EVERYONE'S MOTIONS? THE ISSUE NOW IS, DO YOU WANT TO TAKE
- 7 THESE UP? WE'LL HAVE -- WHY DON'T WE GIVE THEM A MINUTE SO
- 8 THAT THEY CAN GET ALL THESE -- PLACED IN A LIST, AND WE CAN
- 9 ALSO SEE EXACTLY HOW MUCH WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. I'D LIKE TO GET
- 10 A TOTAL ON WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, AND THAT WE'RE
- 11 CONSIDERING IN ALL OF THESE MOTIONS, AND IF YOU'D LIKE TO GO
- 12 TO -- AND WE'LL COME BACK TO THAT. WE CAN GO TO THE NEXT
- 13 ITEMS. YEAH, CALWORKS IS THE NEXT ONE. IS THERE A MOTION ON
- 14 ITEM NUMBER 5? I'LL MOVE ITEM 5.

15

- 16 SUP. KNABE: MADAM -- MADAM CHAIR, I'LL SECOND IT, BUT I HAVE
- 17 AN AMENDMENT, I'M JUST --

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES. YOU'RE -- ARE YOU GOING TO PASS OUT
- 20 YOUR AMENDMENT OR?

- 22 SUP. KNABE: YEAH. HOPEFULLY MY STAFF HAS THEM. THE -- THIS IS
- 23 -- THIS IS JUST TO SEEK SOME OTHER OPPORTUNITIES. ALTHOUGH THE
- 24 ALLOCATION PERFORMANCES INCENTIVE DOLLARS FOR VEHICLE REPAIR
- 25 DOES NOT HAVE UNANIMOUS SUPPORT, THE CONCEPT OF THIS VEHICLE



- REPAIR FOR CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS MERITS FURTHER EXPLORATION. 1
- IN MANY CASES, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DOES NOT WORK FOR 2
- CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS IN NOT ONLY THEIR SEARCH TO FIND 3
- EMPLOYMENT, BUT IN THE TRANSPORTATION TO THEIR JOBS ONCE 4
- 5 HIRED. FURTHER, IN MANY INSTANCES, THE CAR REPAIRS ARE TOO
- COSTLY FOR THEIR WAGES, AND IF REPAIRING THEIR OLDER VEHICLES 6
- 7 COULD ASSIST THEM IN LOCATING AND MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT, THEN
- 8 WE SHOULD TRY TO BE CREATIVE IN IDENTIFYING A PROGRAM THAT
- 9 COULD HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT. ONE OPTION NOT YET CONSIDERED IS
- THE POTENTIAL FOR THE AUTO MECHANIC TRAINING PROGRAMS OFFERED 10
- 11 AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES, R.O.C.'S, HIGH SCHOOLS, AND ADULT
- SCHOOLS, TO USE VEHICLES OWNED BY CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS AS 12
- 13 HANDS-ON CURRICULUM ON THE STUDENTS ENROLLED. IF STRUCTURED
- CORRECTLY, THIS COULD BE A WIN-WIN SITUATION FOR EVERYONE. SO 14
- I WOULD THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL 15
- 16 SERVICES EXPLORE WITH THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES THE REGIONAL
- OCCUPATION CENTERS COMMUNITY ADULT SCHOOLS AS WELL AS THE 17
- 18 COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND THE UNIFIED -- LOS ANGELES
- 19 UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE POTENTIAL FOR THEIR AUTO MECHANIC
- STUDENTS TO PERFORM VEHICLE REPAIRS FOR CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS 20
- AND REPORT BACK IN 60 DAYS WITH FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 21
- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, WITHOUT --
- SUP. ANTONOVICH: SECONDED. 25

22



1

- 2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S SECONDED. WITHOUT OBJECTION, AND
- 3 THAT AMENDMENT WILL BE ADDED TO IT. I HAVE AN AMENDMENT THAT
- 4 I'M PASSING OUT. THE REJECTION OF AVAILABLE PERFORMANCE
- 5 INCENTIVE FUNDS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA CREATED THE NEED
- 6 TO REEVALUATE THE LONG-TERM FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PLAN. IN
- 7 ORDER TO CONDUCT AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED FUNDS,
- 8 THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ENCOURAGED THE PARTICIPATION OF A
- 9 DIVERSE GROUP OF COMMUNITY ADVOCATES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO
- 10 REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS. AND THIS WAS
- 11 UNPRECEDENTED, ACTUALLY, IN COMING TO THIS APPROACH. FOLLOWING
- 12 UNPRECEDENTED COLLABORATION WITH COUNTY DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER
- 13 AGENCIES, THE STAKEHOLDERS REACHED CONSENSUS ON 99% OF ALL
- 14 AVAILABLE FUNDING. IN ORDER TO UPHOLD THE INTEGRITY OF THE
- 15 PROCESS, WE NEED TO SUPPORT THE STAKEHOLDER'S RECOMMENDATION
- 16 IN A FISCALLY PRUDENT MANNER AND ALLOCATE THE REMAINING 1%
- 17 WITH THE BEST INTERESTS OF CALWORKS PARTICIPANTS IN MIND, AND
- 18 IT WOULD ADOPT THAT 1% OF THAT AS IS SET FORTH IN THE DETAILS
- 19 OF THE MOTION. THIS IS JUST AN AMENDMENT TO 5. WITHOUT
- 20 OBJECTION, THEN, THAT AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED ON NUMBER 5. ARE
- 21 THERE OTHER AMENDMENTS TO -- HERE'S MY AMENDMENT. DO YOU HAVE
- 22 THAT?

23

24 SUP. MOLINA: YES I HAVE IT.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY, YOU HAVE IT. OKAY. THEN IT'S -- IS
- 2 THERE A MOTION TO ADOPT NUMBER 5? MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY,
- 3 SECONDED BY KNABE. ITEM NUMBER 5 IS ADOPTED. ITEM NUMBER 6 --
- 4 WITH THE AMENDMENTS, THERE'S TWO AMENDMENTS, KNABE'S AMENDMENT
- 5 AND MY AMENDMENT, WHICH WAS CO-AUTHORED WITH MOLINA. MY
- 6 AMENDMENT WAS CO-AUTHORED WITH YOU, YES. OKAY. SO IT'S SO
- 7 ORDERED. ITEM 6.

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 6 ARE PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATIONS
- 10 RECOMMENDED BY THE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES.

11

- 12 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND MADAM CHAIR, I'LL READ THE SHORT
- 13 TITLE INTO THE RECORD. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 6,
- 14 SALARIES, OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CODE TO REFLECT TITLE
- 15 CHANGES AND THE DELETION OF NONREPRESENTED CLASSES AS A RESULT
- 16 OF THE BUDGET PROCESS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003/2004.

17

18 SUP. KNABE: MOVE IT.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, MOVED BY KNABE, SECONDED BY
- 21 YAROSLAVSKY. WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. ITEM NUMBER 7.

- 23 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND MADAM CHAIR, I'LL READ THAT SHORT
- 24 TITLE INTO THE RECORD. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 5,
- 25 PERSONNEL, AND TITLE 6, SALARIES, OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY



- 1 CODE TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OFFICE OF
- 2 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMPLIANCE WITH RESPECT TO INVESTIGATIONS
- 3 TO REFLECT POSITIONS INCLUDED IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2003/2004
- 4 PROPOSED BUDGET AND TO MODIFY SALARY PLACEMENT PROVISIONS FOR
- 5 EMPLOYEES COVERED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PERFORMANCE-
- 6 BASED PAY PLAN AND ELIMINATE OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE -- IT'S MOVED BY ANTONOVICH,
- 9 SECONDED BY MOLINA. WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. ITEM 8. THE
- 10 DEBT MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MADAM CHAIR, ITEM 8 HAS A NUMBER OF TECHNICAL
- 13 ADJUSTMENTS THAT WE MAKE, WE'RE REQUIRED TO REPORT ON THE DEBT
- 14 MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES THAT THE BOARD ADOPTED SOME TIME AGO.
- 15 HOW CLOSE WE ARE TO THOSE, AND ALSO APPROVE EXPENDITURES FOR
- 16 LACK CAL, WHICH ARE EQUIPMENT PURCHASES, PRIMARILY IN THE
- 17 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AND THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: COULD WE HAVE THE LIGHTS BACK ON? WE'RE
- 20 HAVING DIFFICULTY READING. GOOD. THANK YOU.

21

22 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WELL CAN WE TAKE OUT THE THIRD ROW? I MEAN --

23

24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: LET THERE BE LIGHT. NO 8.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO, WELL IT'S NOT GOING TO BE LONG. LET'S
- 2 SEE IF WE CAN JUST STAND IT FOR A FEW MINUTES. OKAY. ALL
- 3 RIGHT. ITEM NUMBER 8.

4

5 **SPEAKER:** (INAUDIBLE).

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I DON'T KNOW. ANY RATE, THE LIGHTS, THERE'S
- 8 ONLY ONE SWITCH THAT CONTROLS EVERYTHING, SO WE CAN'T DIVIDE
- 9 UP THE LIGHTS. WE'D HAVE TO HAVE THEM ON OR OFF.

10

- 11 SUP.ANTONOVICH: WE'VE ADDED SOME LIGHTS HERE TO COME DOWN ON
- 12 US. ALL RIGHT WE'LL ASK THEM TO CHECK ON WHICH LIGHTS THEY --
- 13 PROBABLY THE GLOBES WENT OUT AND THEY REPLACED THEM, THE LIGHT
- 14 GLOBES. OKAY. JUST A -- IT'LL BE JUST A MINUTE. WHAT, IS
- 15 SOMEONE ELSE COMPLAINING ABOUT THE -- TOO COLD OR TOO HOT?

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, NO, NO. WE WERE JUST TRYING TO STRAIGHTEN
- 18 OUT THE FUNDS.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY ITEM 8 IS THE DEBT MANAGEMENT
- 21 GUIDELINES. DO WE HAVE A MOTION?

22

23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MOVE IT.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY, SECONDED BY
- 2 ANTONOVICH. WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. NOW, ITEM NUMBER 9
- 3 THROUGH --

4

- 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MADAM CHAIR, THERE IS A DIFFERENCE. ITEM 9 AND
- 6 10 WERE SPECIFICALLY REFERRED TO TODAY THIS YEAR. ITEMS 11
- 7 THROUGH 19 ARE BOARD ITEMS REFERRED FROM LAST YEAR'S BUDGET.
- 8 SO ITEM NUMBER 9, THE LIBRARY TAX, WAS REFERRED FROM A COUPLE
- 9 OF WEEKS AGO, AND NUMBER 10, THE M.R.S.A., I THINK THERE'S
- 10 ALREADY BEEN A MOTION ON THE M.R.S.A., AND THEN 11 THROUGH 19
- 11 ARE REALLY FROM LAST YEAR'S BUDGET, AND 11-19, I WOULD ASSUME,
- 12 COULD ALL BE DEALT WITH AT THE SAME TIME AND COULD BE NOTE AND
- 13 FILE.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I WOULD MOVE APPROVAL OF ITEM 9.

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT IT'S BEEN -- ITEM 9'S BEEN MOVED
- 18 BY YAROSLAVSKY, SECONDED BY KNABE. DID YOU MAKE THAT MOTION,
- 19 OR DID --

20

21 SPEAKER: NUMBER NINE ON THAT BOARD --

22

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, NO, OR JUST NUMBER 9 ON THE AGENDA, SO
- 24 LIBRARY TAX.



```
SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THERE'S A SPECIAL TAX.
2
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE LIBRARY TAX.
3
4
5
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: LIBRARY TAX.
6
7
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 9 ON TODAY'S AGENDA.
8
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. IS IT SECONDED BY KNABE?
10
11
    SUP. KNABE: NO.
12
13
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO.
14
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU CAN SECOND IT.
15
16
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I'LL SECOND IT THEN, ALL RIGHT, ON ITEM 9,
17
18
    LET'S CALL THE ROLL.
19
20
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA.
21
22
    SUP. MOLINA: AYE.
23
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY.
24
25
```



SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YES.

CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR KNABE.

SUP. KNABE: AYE.

6

7 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH.

8

9 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE SAME.

10

11 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** AND SUPERVISOR BURKE.

12

13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AYE. SO ITEM 9 IS APPROVED.

14

15 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** THE MOTION CARRIES.

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NOW, ITEM 10 IS SIMILAR TO ANOTHER MOTION
- 18 THAT WAS INTRODUCED. WHICH ONE -- OH IT DIDN'T GET A SECOND.

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT DID NOT GET A SECOND I GUESS.

21

22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. ITEM 10 DID NOT GET A SECOND.

- 24 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ON THAT ITEM 10 WE'RE WORKING WITH THE
- 25 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT TO INCLUDE IT WITHIN THEIR BUDGET.



```
1
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. OKAY. SO WILL BE NO ACTION ON
2
    ITEM 10. THERE'S NO MOTION.
3
4
5
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: ALL RIGHT.
6
7
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ON NOW 11 THROUGH --
8
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: 19.
10
11
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: 19, TO RECEIVE AND FILE. IS THERE A MOTION?
12
13
    SUP. KNABE: YEAH, MOVE TO RECEIVE IN FILE.
14
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SECOND.
15
16
17
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY.
18
19
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT DID YOU DO WITH NUMBER 10?
20
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NUMBER 10, THERE WAS NO MOTION.
21
22
23
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BECAUSE?
24
```



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HE'S WORKING WITH THE SHERIFF ON THAT. 11
- 2 THROUGH 19 IS TO RECEIVE AND FILE. WE'LL NOW GO BACK TO --

3

4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NUMBER 4.

5

6 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE ITEMS THAT WE ARE HOLDING.

7

- 8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: LET ME ASK ONE QUESTION, AND I DON'T KNOW IF
- 9 THE MOTION IS APPROPRIATE TODAY OR TOMORROW, BUT ON THE ISSUE
- 10 OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND THEIR BUDGET, SOME OF YOUR
- 11 RECOMMENDATIONS, I MET WITH THE STATE ON FRIDAY, AND I GUESS
- 12 YOU MET WITH THEM ON THURSDAY, AND THAT THE QUESTIONS THAT
- 13 THEY HAVE AND THE MOTION I HAVE DEALT WITH HAVING THE AUDITOR-
- 14 CONTROLLER VERIFY THE NUMBERS THAT WE'RE GETTING FROM YOU AND
- 15 FROM THE DEPARTMENT AND THE STATE, SO THAT MOTION WOULD BE
- 16 MORE APPROPRIATE FOR TOMORROW TO INTRODUCE?

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SUPER -- THIS IS ON CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT,
- 19 I THINK EITHER DAY IT'S APPROPRIATE SUPERVISOR, IT IS A BUDGET
- 20 ISSUE

21

- 22 SUP. ANTONOVICH: IT'S A BUDGET ISSUE. AND THEN WHERE ON THE
- 23 AGENDA WOULD THIS BE APPROPRIATE TO INTRODUCE?



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I WOULD THINK UNDER ITEM NUMBER 4, WHERE YOU
- 2 ARE RIGHT NOW.

3

- 4 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY. MADAM CHAIR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU'VE
- 5 HEARD THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE C.A.O. AND MYSELF RIGHT NOW.

6

7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

8

- 9 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE THIS MOTION. THIS
- 10 PERTAINS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN SERVICES RELATIVE FROM
- 11 MY MEETING WITH THE STATE ON FRIDAY AND DAVID MET WITH THEM, I
- 12 BELIEVE, ON THURSDAY, AND ITS BUDGETARY BUT IT'S ASKING FOR
- 13 THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER TO VERIFY SOME OF THESE FIGURES, SO HE
- 14 SAID IT WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE ITEM FOR IT.

15

16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, RIGHT.

- 18 SUP. ANTONOVICH: LET ME JUST READ THE MOTION, IT SAYS PRIOR TO
- 19 THE CHILD SUPPORT LEGISLATION IN '99, THE ADMINISTRATION OF
- 20 FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES RESTED WITH
- 21 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. SINCE THE CREATION OF THE STATE, DEPARTMENT
- 22 OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES, THE CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
- 23 DEPARTMENT HAS BECOME A STATE DIRECTED, LOCALLY-DELIVERED
- 24 PROGRAM. THE FUNDING IS SHARED BETWEEN THE FEDERAL PAYING TWO-
- 25 THIRDS AND THE STATE PAYING ONE-THIRD. ACCORDING TO THE



- 1 DIRECTOR OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES,
- 2 L.A. COUNTY HAS BEEN RETURNING UNALLOCATED FUNDS FOR THE PAST
- 3 THREE YEARS AS FOLLOWS. \$8 MILLION IN 2000, 3.2 MILLION IN
- 4 2001, 7.7 MILLION IN 2002. SO I'D LIKE TO MOVE THAT THE BOARD
- 5 WOULD DIRECT THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER AND THE C.A.O. TO WORK IN
- 6 CONCERT WITH CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES TO, ONE, IDENTIFY ALL
- 7 AVAILABLE AVENUES AVAILABLE TO THE CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
- 8 DEPARTMENT TO GAIN MORE FUNDING FROM THE STATE AND FEDERAL
- 9 GOVERNMENT, CONDUCT AN AUDIT OF THE EXISTING SERVICE CONTRACTS
- 10 FOR COST EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS, REVIEW THE CURRENT
- 11 CURTAILMENT THAT'S CONTEMPLATED BY C.S.S.D., INCLUDING THE
- 12 PROPORTION OF THE CUTS TO SERVICES AND SUPPLIES, TO CUTS IN
- 13 STAFFING, FIND CREATIVE SOLUTIONS TO MINIMIZE THE NUMBER OF
- 14 STAFF LAYOFFS AND REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD WITH FINDINGS AND
- 15 RECOMMENDATIONS IN 30 DAYS. SO IT'S A REPORT BACK.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: LET ME JUST UNDERSTAND BEFORE -- CLARIFY
- 18 WHAT THIS MEANS. IN THE MEANTIME, IF THIS WERE TO BE APPROVED,
- 19 IN THE MEANTIME, THE BUDGET THAT WE'RE -- IF WE APPROVE YOUR
- 20 BUDGET, ESSENTIALLY AS RECOMMENDED, WITH WHATEVER OTHER
- 21 NOTIFICATIONS WE HAVE, THE LAYOFFS START THE 1ST OF JULY, DO
- 22 THEY NOT? SO THIS IS IN NO WAY GOING TO -- I MEAN I JUST THINK
- 23 WE NEED TO BE CLEAR, THIS IN NO WAY RETARDS THAT ACTION.



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I DON'T SEE IT RETARDING THAT. WHAT I SEE
- 2 THIS DOING IS PROVIDING US WITH THAT INFORMATION, BECAUSE THE
- 3 STATE IS TELLING US THEY HAVE ALREADY GIVEN US THE MONEY TO DO
- 4 WHAT WE'RE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING, BECAUSE IT'S A STATE-FUNDED
- 5 PROGRAM, AND --

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT THE STATE -- BUT YOU WON'T HAVE THAT IN
- 8 --

9

- 10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AND THE FACT THAT WE'VE BEEN RETURNING --
- 11 WE'VE BEEN TURNING MONEY BACK TO THE STATE SO IT'S GETTING
- 12 ACCOUNTABILITY.

13

- 14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT YOU WON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION FOR
- 15 ANOTHER 30 DAYS, AND BY THAT TIME, WE WILL BE LAYING PEOPLE
- 16 OFF.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND REDUCING THEIR -- BEGINNING THE PROCESS
- 21 OF BUDGET REDUCTION.

22

23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

24

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR --



1

2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THAT'S UNDERSTOOD.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND IF AT THE END OF THIS REVIEW, AND THE
- 5 AUDIT WILL TAKE EVEN LONGER, I'M NOT SURE WHAT THAT DOES FOR
- 6 IT, BUT ANYWAY BY THE TIME WE GET THAT INFORMATION, IF IT
- 7 TURNS OUT THAT THE STATE'S RIGHT AND THEN AT THAT POINT, WE
- 8 COULD REVERSE COURSE, I GUESS, BUT I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE
- 9 NOBODY HAS ANY FALSE EXPECTATIONS OUT THERE ABOUT WHAT THIS
- 10 MEANS. I'LL SECOND IT.

11

- 12 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S MOVED AND SECONDED WITHOUT OBJECTION.
- 13 IT'S A REPORT-BACK MOTION, IT'S IN ORDER. SO ORDERED. WE'LL
- 14 NOW -- HAS EVERYONE RECEIVED THE FINAL LIST? AND AS A MATTER
- 15 OF CLARIFICATION, THESE ARE PART OF BUDGET DELIBERATIONS.
- 16 THERE ARE NO HEARINGS ON THESE ITEMS. THESE ITEMS WILL BE
- 17 DISCUSSED, AND ANYONE WHO WISHES TO CALL SOMEONE UP TO EXPLAIN
- 18 THEM OR TO GET CLARIFICATION, DEPARTMENT HEADS CAN COME UP OR
- 19 THE AUDITOR OR THE C.A.O. WE'LL CALL ON BASICALLY TO EXPLAIN
- 20 THEM. STARTING WITH NUMBER ONE, WHICH IS MOLINA'S MOTION ON
- 21 PUBLIC LIBRARIES, AND THIS IS FOR 7.7 MILLION, AND --

22

23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MADAM CHAIR?

24

25 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES?



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: COULD I -- FIRST OF ALL LET ME SAY THAT THE
- 3 FUNDING SOURCES THAT THE SUPERVISOR RECOMMENDS ARE
- 4 APPROPRIATE. THERE IS MONEY IN P.F.U. FOR THAT -- THAT WAS
- 5 ROLLED INTO P.F.U. FROM SAVINGS. I WAS NOT AWARE OF THAT WHEN
- 6 I SAID THAT. SO THE FUNDS ARE OKAY. MY QUESTION IS, WHAT IS
- 7 THE 7.7 MILLION FOR? BECAUSE WE ONLY REDUCED THE BUDGET 7.3, I
- 8 BELIEVE.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: IT WAS IN CASE OF THE PARCEL TAX SITUATION,

11

12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT, THEN IT WAS PASSED.

13

14 SUP. MOLINA: BUT I THINK WE'VE RESOLVED THAT SO.

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT SHOULD BE 7.3?

17

18 SUP. MOLINA: YES.

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY.

21

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. SO THAT WOULD BE -- DO YOU WANT
- 23 TO THEN MOVE IT AT 7.3?

24

25 SUP. MOLINA: AS AMENDED RIGHT.



1

2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: FOR 7.3, AND WITH THE AMENDMENTS THAT WERE

3 ADOPTED.

4

5 SUP. MOLINA: THAT'S CORRECT.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THERE WERE A COUPLE OF AMENDMENTS THAT WERE
- 8 ADOPTED INCLUDING PUTTING ON THE BALLOT THE ASSESSMENT AS WELL
- 9 AS CONTINUING TO WORK TO TRY TO FIND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.

10

- 11 SUP. KNABE: I MEAN, CAN WE BIFURCATE THAT PART? I MEAN I MAY
- 12 SUPPORT THAT, BUT I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S PLENTY CLEAR
- 13 THAT THOSE THAT SUPPORT IT, THOSE WHO ARE PAYING MORE THAN
- 14 THEY'RE GETTING, THAT WE HAVE A REAL CLARIFICATION AND NOT
- 15 JUST GOING OUT WITH A HAMMER TO THESE CITIES.

16

- 17 SUP. MOLINA: NO. I THINK THAT'S A FAIR CLARIFICATION. I DON'T
- 18 MIND PUTTING IT IN THAT WAY SO IT'S A CLARIFICATION, BECAUSE I
- 19 AGREE THAT IF, IN FACT, THESE CITIES ARE PROVIDING ENOUGH
- 20 FUNDING FOR THEIR LIBRARIES, THERE'S NO REASON TO PASS ON A
- 21 PARCEL TAX. THERE ARE SOME CITIES THAT ARE NOT.

- 23 SUP. KNABE: NO, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT PART, AND -- 'CAUSE MY
- 24 ISSUE IS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE MAY AT SOME POINT, I MEAN WE DO
- 25 MEASURE B AND WE'VE DONE THESE OTHER THINGS, AT SOME POINT,



- 1 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A CREDIBILITY PROBLEM IF, YOU KNOW, WE
- 2 HAVE JUST KEEP, YOU KNOW, GOING TO THESE CITIES AND THEY DO
- 3 PASS IT AND THEN THEY DON'T GET THE SERVICE. SO I JUST WANT TO
- 4 MAKE SURE IT'S JUST NOT SOME GENERIC THING. YOU'RE JUST ASKING
- 5 FOR THE CITIES THAT HAVE NOT APPROVED IT. IS THAT CORRECT?

6

7 SUP. MOLINA: AGAIN, I --

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. THE CITIES WHO HAVE NOT APPROVED IT
- 10 WOULD HAVE TO PUT IT ON BY JULY 1ST.

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: YES, BUT AT THE SAME TIME, WHAT DON IS SAYING
- 13 THERE ARE SOME CITIES THAT DON'T NEED TO PUT THIS ON.

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT, OKAY. SUP. MOLINA: BECAUSE THEIR
- 16 ALLOCATION, AND SO WHAT I AM SAYING IS THAT ONLY IN THOSE
- 17 CITIES THAT ARE -- THAT WE'RE CLOSING THOSE SERVICES BECAUSE
- 18 THEY AREN'T THERE, AND THERE IS A LIST OF THEM.

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YEAH, THAT'S CLEAR TO EVERYONE, ISN'T IT?

21

22 SUP. KNABE: WELL, YEAH, SORT OF, I MEAN AND I'VE GOT SOME --

23

24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DO YOU WANT TO STATE IT?



- 1 SUP. KNABE: I'VE GOT SOME CITIES, I MEAN, MOST OF MY CITIES
- 2 SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE ARE THE ONES THAT APPROVED IT, AND
- 3 THAT'S THE IRONY OF ALL OF THIS.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YEAH SO ARE MINE -- NO, NOT ALL OF MINE.
- 6 ONE OF THEM IS.

7

- 8 SUP. MOLINA: WELL, I MEAN, IS IT UNDERSTOOD AS THAT, OR DO YOU
- 9 -- THAT I THINK THAT --

10

- 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ONLY THOSE CITIES THAT HAVE NOT PASSED THE
- 12 ASSESSMENT WOULD THAT AMENDMENT APPLY TO.

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: I KNOW, BUT YVONNE, THAT, TOO, IS -- THAT'S WHAT
- 15 I SAID, BUT THAT STATEMENT WOULD NOT BE FITTING INTO SOME OF
- 16 THE AREAS THAT DON IS TALKING ABOUT, BECAUSE THEY DON'T NEED
- 17 TO PASS THE ASSESSMENT AND THEY ARE PASSING ON FAIRLY GENEROUS
- 18 ALLOCATIONS TO THE LIBRARIES, IS WHAT DON IS SAYING.

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THEY'RE STILL ON THE LIST TO CLOSE?

- 22 SUP. KNABE: YEAH THAT'S WHY I WOULD ASK THAT I MEAN, IF WE
- 23 COULD BIFURCATE IT AND APPROVE YOUR ALLOCATION AND THEN MAYBE
- 24 BRING BACK TOMORROW SO WE COULD GET THE CITIES OR JUST GET A
- 25 QUICK --



1

- 2 SUP. MOLINA: I THINK, AGAIN, I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT.
- 3 I THINK THE LIBRARIAN DOES HAVE A LIST OF THOSE CITIES, AND
- 4 WE'D BE HAPPY TO DO THAT.

5

- 6 SUP. KNABE: OKAY, AND BRING IT TOMORROW THEN AT OUR REGULAR
- 7 MEETING?

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND WE WOULD HAVE A LIST OF THE CITIES BACK
- 10 TOMORROW.

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. THAT AMENDMENT, I'LL MOVE OVER 'TIL
- 13 TOMORROW, BUT I'D LIKE TO PASS THE MOTION AS IS.

14

15 SUP. KNABE: OH YEAH, YEAH ABSOLUTELY.

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED
- 18 WITH THE UNDERSTANDING WE'LL HAVE THE LISTS OF CITIES
- 19 TOMORROW. WITHOUT OBJECTION, THEN THAT IS APPROVED. THAT'S THE
- 20 FIRST ONE. THE SECOND ITEM IS THE MOTION ON THE LIFEGUARDS FOR
- 21 \$650,000.

22

23 SUP. KNABE: MOVE IT.

24

25 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SECOND.

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED, WITHOUT OBJECTION --2 3 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MADAM --4 5 SUP. MOLINA: CAN WE BACK UP, I ASKED THE QUESTION ABOUT WHERE 6 7 THE MONEY WAS GOING. 8 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, MADAM CHAIR --10 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I'M SORRY. 12 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: PROVISIONAL FINANCING IS NOT I THINK, THE RIGHT PLACE. IF THE BOARD WANTS TO ALLOCATE THE MONEY, IT 14 SHOULD BE FROM FINANCING ELEMENTS. 15 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: FROM FINANCE? 17 18 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: FINANCING ELEMENTS, THAT'S WHERE THE FUND 20 BALANCE IS. 21 22 SUP. MOLINA: WAIT. LET ME UNDERSTAND THAT, THIS IS --23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I'M GOING TO TELL YOU WHAT'S IN P.F.U. 24



SUP. MOLINA: CAN YOU FINANCE STAFFING DOLLARS?

2

- 3 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YOU CAN USE ONE-TIME MONEY FOR OPERATIONS.
- 4 THAT'S WHAT WE DID LAST YEAR FOR THE LIBRARIES. THAT'S WHY WE
- 5 DIDN'T BUDGET IT AGAIN. YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE THE SAME PROBLEM
- 6 WITH LIBRARIES NEXT YEAR, THE \$7.3 MILLION IS ONE-TIME MONEY.
- 7 THIS IS THE SAME.

8

- 9 SUP. MOLINA: THIS IS ONE-TIME MONEY, BUT IT ISN'T FINANCING
- 10 THOSE DOLLARS.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEY'RE BOTH ONE-TIME MONEYS. IT'S FUND
- 13 BALANCE, ESSENTIALLY, IS WHAT YOU'RE USING TO FUND THEM. BUT
- 14 THE TECHNICAL --

15

16 SUP. MOLINA: MAYBE I MISUNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU SAID.

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY, THE TECHNICAL PLACE IS NOT PROVISIONAL
- 19 FINANCING FOR THIS PURPOSE, BECAUSE IN THAT ACCOUNT IS WHERE
- 20 WE HAVE THE MONEY FROM MACLAREN THAT GOES INTO THE CHILDREN'S
- 21 DEPARTMENT. WE HAVE FOOD STAMPS --

22

23 SUP. MOLINA: DAVID, I UNDERSTAND THAT.



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY, THE PLACE TO GO IS CALLED FINANCING
- 2 ELEMENTS, AND IT'S ON PAGE 10 OF OUR LETTER IN NUMBER 3.

3

4 SUP. MOLINA: AND HOW MUCH MONEY YOU GOT IN FINANCING --

5

6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: \$150 MILLION IS WHAT OUR RESERVE IS.

7

- 8 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. SO NOW IT'S A RESERVE. SO NOW THIS
- 9 MONEY IS COMING OUT OF THE RESERVE.

10

- 11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT -- I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT INSTEAD OF
- 12 P.F.U., IF YOU CHOOSE TO USE THAT MONEY.

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT, LET ME UNDERSTAND THAT CORRECTLY AGAIN.
- 15 THIS MONEY IS COMING OUT OF THE RESERVE.

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT IS CORRECT.

18

19 SUP. MOLINA: NOT OUT OF A P.F.U.

20

21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT IS CORRECT.

22

- 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED. IS
- 24 THERE OBJECTION?



1 SUP. MOLINA: YES. I'M VOTING AGAINST IT.

2

- 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THERE'S 4-TO-1 ON THE LIFEGUARD.
- 4 ON PARKS AND RECREATION, ANTONOVICH'S MOTION ON PARKS AND
- 5 RECREATION, CASTAIC LAKE, THAT HAS NO NET COUNTY COST. IS THAT
- 6 CORRECT?

7

8 SUP. MOLINA: SO WHERE IS THE MONEY FROM?

9

- 10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: IT'S TAKEN FROM THEIR BUDGET, BECAUSE WE'RE
- 11 GETTING -- ANTICIPATING THE STATE, WHEN THEY PASS THEIR
- 12 BUDGET, WE WILL BE RECEIVING THE FUNDING FOR CASTAIC AND
- 13 PLACERITA.

14

15 SUP. MOLINA: WAIT, I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT.

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT 400,000.

18

- 19 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YOU'RE TAKING THE MONEY FROM WITHIN THE
- 20 DEPARTMENT.

21

- 22 SUP. MOLINA: OH BUT IS THE DEPARTMENT CUTTING BACK ON
- 23 SOMETHING ELSE?



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE DEPARTMENT IS TAKING THOSE FUNDS ON THE
- 2 ANTICIPATION THAT THE STATE WILL BE PROVIDING THOSE RESOURCES.

3

4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S FOR -- UNTIL AUGUST ONLY.

5

- 6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: RIGHT, THIS IS BEING FUNDED THROUGH AUGUST
- 7 AND --

8

9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO WHAT DOES THIS MOTION DO?

10

11 SUP. MOLINA: IT FUNDS IT.

12

- 13 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THIS MOTION WILL DO IS TO MAINTAIN CASTAIC
- 14 THROUGH AUGUST, WITH THE -- THE DIRECTOR OF THE PARKS IS HERE,
- 15 TIM GALLAGHER.

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WHAT IT MEANS, IF I'M HEARING IT CORRECTLY, IS
- 18 IF THE STATE DOES NOT PICK UP THE OPERATIONS, THEN THE
- 19 DEPARTMENT WOULD HAVE TO FIND THAT MONEY SOMEWHERE ELSE IN
- 20 THEIR BUDGET. RIGHT?

21

- 22 SUP. MOLINA: WELL THAT'S WHAT I WAS SAYING. JUST SO, THEY'VE
- 23 GOT TO CUT SOMETHING ELSE.

24

25 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THEY WOULD HAVE TO CUT SOMETHING ELSE.

24

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



```
1
2
    SUP. MOLINA: AND I'M VERY CONCERNED BECAUSE IT --
3
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT THIS IS ONLY 'TIL AUGUST, THE $400,000.
4
5
    SUP. MOLINA: I KNOW BUT YVONNE, IT COULD -- IT'S STILL MONEY
6
7
    THAT IS GOING TO BE CUT OUT OF OTHER AREAS.
8
    SUP. ANTONOVICH: PART 2 OF THE BUDGET INSTRUCTS THE C.A.O. TO
    REVIEW THOSE SAVINGS IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR TO COVER THOSE
10
11
    COSTS IF THE STATE DOES NOT ALLOCATE FUNDING AND THEY WILL
    REPORT BACK TO THIS BODY.
12
13
    SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. SO IT'S ONLY A REPORT NOW, AND THERE'S
14
    NO MONEY ATTACHED TO THIS?
15
16
    SUP. ANTONOVICH: TIM -- NO, YOU'RE --
17
18
19
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY.
20
    SUP. MOLINA: YES. SAY THAT TO ME, DAVID.
21
22
23
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: THERE IS AN EXPENDITURE ATTACHED TO IT.
```



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE EXPENSE IS USING -- THEY'RE USING 400,000
- 2 NOW WITH THE ANTICIPATION THAT THE STATE WILL REIMBURSE US
- 3 WHEN THEY PASS THEIR BUDGET.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OUT OF PARK'S BUDGET, YEAH. BUT WHERE --
- 6 WHAT -- WHERE DO THEY TAKE IT FROM, IN THEIR BUDGET?

7

8 SUP. MOLINA: EXPLAIN.

9

- 10 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: YOU ARE CORRECT SUPERVISOR, THIS WOULD COME
- 11 OUT OF THE BOTTOM LINE OF OUR '03/'04 BUDGET. I'M NOT EXCITED
- 12 ABOUT THIS MOTION BUT I FEEL VERY CONFIDENT THAT WITH
- 13 CONTINUED OPERATION OF CASTAIC GOING TO PUT MORE PRESSURE ON
- 14 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR PERMANENT
- 15 OPERATION OF CASTAIC AND PLACERITA. SO ON DISCUSSIONS WITH --

16

- 17 SUP. MOLINA: AND MANY OTHERS, BUT YOU'RE SAYING SOMETHING
- 18 DIFFERENT THAN -- IS THERE MONEY IN YOUR BUDGET NOW FOR
- 19 SERVICES TO COVER CASTAIC LAKE?

20

21 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: ONLY FOR FIRST TEN DAYS OF FISCAL YEAR.

- 23 SUP. MOLINA: ONLY FOR THE FIRST TEN DAYS. SO WHAT THIS -- WHAT
- 24 THIS MOTION DOES IT NOW COVERS IT 'TIL, WHAT, THE END OF
- 25 AUGUST?



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES. 2 3 SUP. MOLINA: THE END OF AUGUST. SO THOSE DOLLARS ARE GOING TO 4 5 COME OUT OF WHAT? 6 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: THOSE DOLLARS WOULD COME OUT OF THE BOTTOM 7 LINE OF THE '03-'04 BUDGET FOR THE DEPARTMENT. 9 SUP. MOLINA: SO THAT MEANS OTHER SERVICES MAY BE CUT. 10 11 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: THAT'S CORRECT. 12 13 SUP. MOLINA: NOW THAT'S A CONCERN, I WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOU'RE 14 GOING TO CUT. 15 16 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: WELL WHAT WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT IS 17 18 ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS IN OUR OPERATION AND UTILITIES AND 19 PURCHASING MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES. QUITE FRANKLY THAT'S WHAT 20 WE HAVE TO LOOK AT. HONESTLY RIGHT --21 22 SUP. MOLINA: BUT CAN I BE ASSURED THAT THERE WILL BE NO CUT IN

24

23

SERVICES OR PROGRAMS?



- 1 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: I DO NOT PLAN ON CUTTING ANY RECREATION
- 2 SERVICES AT OUR COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS OR LOWERING
- 3 OUR PARK MAINTENANCE ANY FURTHER THAN WHAT IT IS.

4

- 5 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT, SO ON AUGUST THE 30TH -- ON SEPTEMBER
- 6 THE 1ST LET'S SAY NOTHING HAPPENS WITH THE LEGISLATURE OR
- 7 THESE FUNDS DON'T COME IN. WHAT HAPPENS THAT DAY?

8

- 9 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: WELL HOPEFULLY WE'D COME BACK TO THE BOARD
- 10 BEFORE SOME POINT IF IT LOOKS LIKE SACRAMENTO'S NOT GOING TO
- 11 HAVE A BUDGET BY SEPTEMBER. YOU KNOW, THAT'S ANYBODY'S GUESS
- 12 AND COME IN WITH SOME PLAN OF ACTION. AGAIN I FEEL VERY
- 13 CONFIDENT THAT IF THE COUNTY STEPS FORWARD AND CONTINUES
- 14 OPERATION OF THE BUDGET OF CASTAIC UNTIL THE STATE RESOLVES
- 15 THEIR BUDGET IT'S GOING TO PUT ADDITIONAL PRESSURE ON
- 16 SACRAMENTO TO PROVIDE FUNDING.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: WELL I WOULD HOPE THAT THAT WOULD BE THE CASE BUT
- 19 USUALLY WHAT HAPPENS IS SACRAMENTO SEE THINGS WORKING AND
- 20 THEY'RE SAYING OBVIOUSLY THEY DON'T NEED THE MONEY. THAT'S WHY
- 21 I'M ASKING YOU THIS SPECIFIC QUESTION.

22

23 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: RIGHT.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: ON SEPTEMBER THE 1ST IF THE MONEY ISN'T THERE
- 2 WHAT WILL YOUR DEPARTMENT DO?

3

4 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: AT THIS TIME I --

5

6 SUP. MOLINA: UNDER THIS MOTION.

7

- 8 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: YEAH, UNFORTUNATELY AT THIS TIME I COULDN'T
- 9 GIVE YOU -- I CAN'T GIVE YOU A DEFINITIVE ANSWER, WE WOULD
- 10 COME BACK FOR PLAN, IT COULD BE ONE OF TWO THINGS, IDENTIFYING
- 11 SOME FUNDING SOURCE FOR CONTINUED OPERATION, UNTIL THE BUDGET
- 12 IS ADOPTED, OR ELSE ACTUALLY TRANSFERRING CASTAIC BACK TO THE
- 13 STATE OF CALIFORNIA ON SEPTEMBER 1ST

14

- 15 SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT, I JUST WANT THAT CLARIFICATION IN PLACE
- 16 'CAUSE I DON'T WANT YOU TO ASSUME -- WHILE I THINK IT IS
- 17 WONDERFUL THAT WE WOULD PROVIDE SERVICES FOR CASTAIC, I THINK
- 18 IT'S AN ESSENTIAL RESOURCE TO OUR COUNTY, I WOULD HOPE THAT
- 19 YOU WOULD COME BACK AND NOT JUST ASSUME THAT THIS MOTION SAYS
- 20 LOOK FOR FUNDS IN OTHER AREAS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR BECAUSE THE
- 21 STATE MAY NOT BE AS GENEROUS AS WE THINK THEY'RE GOING TO BE.

- 23 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: NO, I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE TO CARRY
- 24 THROUGH WITH THE THREAT WE'VE MADE WITH SACRAMENTO ABOUT THE
- 25 OPERATION OF THESE STATE-OWNED FACILITIES. AND IF THE FUNDING



- 1 IS NOT PROVIDED BY SACRAMENTO, EITHER WITH THE BUDGET OR BY
- 2 SEPTEMBER 1ST WE HAVE TO COME BACK WITH A PLAN WHICH MAY
- 3 INCLUDE TRANSFERRING THESE FACILITIES BACK TO THE STATE.

4

- 5 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT, JUST FOR A CLARIFICATION THEN, WHAT I
- 6 AM HEARING IS THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE FUNDED THROUGH THE
- 7 DEPARTMENT FROM ITS ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET.

8

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND NOT AFFECT OTHER SERVICES.

10

- 11 SUP. MOLINA: AND NOT AFFECT OTHER SERVICES, THAT'S ALL I
- 12 WANTED TO HEAR, THANK YOU.

13

- 14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND IT'S CLEAR IT CANNOT AFFECT OTHER
- 15 SERVICES.

16

17 TIMOTHY GALLAGHER: OH IT'S CLEAR YEAH, YEAH, IT CANNOT.

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, ALL RIGHT, IS THERE -- IT'S BEEN
- 20 MOVED AND SECONDED. IS THERE AN OBJECTION? WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 21 SO ORDERED. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 5% BUDGET ALLOCATION CUT.
- 22 MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY, SECONDED BY BURKE, IS THERE ANY
- 23 OBJECTION TO THAT?



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: NO, I JUST HAVE A QUESTION. THIS WILL BE
- 2 HOPEFULLY A RESERVE OF DOLLARS THAT WILL BE PLACED IN BUDGET
- 3 UNCERTAINTY. IS THAT CALLED A RESERVE ACCOUNT?

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: SO WHY COULDN'T WE FUND THE LIFEGUARDS UNDER THIS
- 8 BUDGET UNCERTAINTY AMOUNT?

9

10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WE COULD.

11

12 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DO YOU WANT TO DO THAT?

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: WELL ONLY BECAUSE THEN I AM TRYING TO SET UP A
- 15 PREMISE THAT WE SHOULDN'T BE FUNDING ANYTHING UNLESS WE HAVE
- 16 MONEY FOR IT. IF RESERVES ARE RESERVES THEN THEY'RE RESERVES.
- 17 NOW AGAIN IF WE'RE GOING TO DIP IN TO THE RESERVES THEN LET'S
- 18 ALL JUST PUT IN THE MOTIONS AND JUST JUMP INTO THE RESERVES.
- 19 THE FIRST ONE I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THE LIFEGUARDS. I
- 20 KNOW THEY'RE ESSENTIAL. MR. YAROSLAVSKY HAS PUT IN A ITEM THAT
- 21 BRINGS MONEY INTO IT, WHY NOT JUST FUND ITEM TWO WITH IT.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT. WHERE DID
- 24 THE LIBRARY MONEY COME FROM?



- 1 SUP. KNABE: P.F.U.'S, IT CAME FROM P.F.U.'S FOR LIBRARIES FOR
- 2 TWO PROJECTS THAT SUPERVISOR MOLINA DOESN'T SUPPORT, AND I
- 3 UNDERSTAND THAT.

4

- 5 SUP. MOLINA: P.F.U.'S ARE EXACTLY THAT, THAT'S WHY I ASKED
- 6 DAVID FOR THAT CLARIFICATION. WHAT IS A P.F.U., WHAT IS A
- 7 RESERVE, AND WHAT IS -- A P.F.U. IS SITTING THERE WITH A SET
- 8 OF MONEY, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE IS MONEY THAT HE'S BEEN PUTTING
- 9 INTO P.F.U. FOR CERTAIN COMPUTER ENHANCEMENTS AND THINGS OF
- 10 THAT SORT. IT'S SET ASIDE FOR USE. THE SAVINGS IN THE LEGAL
- 11 COST WAS NOT SET ASIDE FOR ITS USE, IT WAS SET ASIDE FOR
- 12 SAVINGS AND THAT IT IS AVAILABLE. IN THIS INSTANCE YOU HAVE A
- 13 BUDGET AMOUNT BY THESE CUTS THAT WE'RE ACCEPTING, AND I HAVE
- 14 NO PROBLEM WITH IT, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE \$775,000, WELL, THE
- 15 LIFEGUARDS ARE GOING TO COST US \$650,000. I WOULD RATHER HAVE
- 16 THAT EXCHANGE AND PRESERVE THE RESERVE. PRESERVE THE RESERVE [
- 17 LAUGHTER].

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM, THAT'S FINE,
- 20 AND -- BUT MY ONLY POINT IS THAT WHETHER YOU DO IT --

21

22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ACTUALLY WHAT WE'VE DONE IS REPLACED IT.

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHETHER YOU DO IT THAT WAY, OR WHETHER YOU
- 25 DO IT OUT OF ANY OF THE -- OUT OF THE RESERVE, OUT OF THE



- 1 DESIGNATION OF BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTIES, OUT OF THE P.F.U.,
- 2 IT'S ALL THE SAME. THE ONLY REASON YOU DID IT OUT OF THE
- 3 P.F.U. OR WE DID IT OUT OF THE P.F.U. FOR LIBRARIES IS BECAUSE
- 4 THERE IS NO CONCOMITANT REDUCTION OF \$ 7 MILLION, \$7.3 MILLION
- 5 THAT YOU CAN JUST SWAP WITH. THE LIFEGUARDS IS A SMALL ENOUGH
- 6 ITEM SO THAT THESE TWO THINGS DO SWAP AND ACTUALLY LEAVES YOU
- 7 100 GRAND ON TOP OF THAT. BUT I DON'T --.

8

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT DIDN'T WE CHANGE IT?

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T SEE THIS AS A MATTER -- AS A BIG
- 12 MATTER OF PRINCIPLE HERE, IT'S A --

13

14 SUP. MOLINA: WHY NOT?

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT IS REALLY A SWAP ANYHOW, I MEAN YOU TOOK
- 17 THE --

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OH IT'S A SWAP WITH P.F.U., IT'S A SWAP WITH
- 20 DESIGNATION -- FOR BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTIES OUT OF THE RESERVE.

21

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT IT WAS FINANCING ELEMENTS WAS A
- 23 SPECIFIC ITEM. DO YOU WANT TO PUT IT BACK IN FINANCING
- 24 ELEMENT?



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, I THINK -- I THINK IF THE BOARD CHOOSES
- 2 USING THE BOARD REDUCTION TO RESTORE THE LIFEGUARDS, IT IS A
- 3 GOOD USE.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SURE IT'S A GOOD USE, I JUST WANT TO BE
- 6 CLEAR THAT IN FIVE MINUTES IF SOMEBODY COMES UP WITH ANOTHER
- 7 GOOD USE AND THERE ISN'T ANOTHER \$650,000 THAT IT'S -- THE
- 8 P.F.U. IS A LEGITIMATE PLACE OR THE DESIGNATION IS A
- 9 LEGITIMATE PLACE, AS WE DID IT WITH THE LIBRARIES, IT'S JUST A
- 10 MATTER OF WHAT WORKS.

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: BUT THAT'S MY WHOLE POINT. THAT IS MY POINT, AND
- 13 THAT'S A POINT I'M TRYING TO MAKE, IS THAT EITHER WE HAVE
- 14 RESERVES OR EITHER WE HAVE MONEY IN THE BUDGET THAT WE CAN
- 15 FIND. EVEN IN MR. ANTONOVICH'S MOTION THAT'S WHY I ASKED WHERE
- 16 THE MONEY IS COMING IN FOR CASTAIC LAKE. WE NEED TO FIND OUT
- 17 IF IT'S FROM THEIR OWN BUDGET AND WHAT IT'S GOING TO AFFECT.
- 18 THIS MOTION IS A GREAT MOTION. IT CUTS FROM OUR OWN BUDGETS
- 19 AND IT'S SOMETHING WE SHOULD ALSO DO. AND AGAIN, IT ALLOCATES
- 20 IT TO A NEEDY AREA IN -- LIKE LIFEGUARDS, IT'S AN AREA WE
- 21 SHOULDN'T CUT. SO THAT'S WHY ALL I AM SAYING, I'M NOT OPPOSED
- 22 TO ADDING -- RESTORING THE LIFEGUARDS, I JUST IT SHOULD SIT IN
- 23 THERE. AND A P.F.U. IS NOT A RESERVE. IT IS NOT. IT IS NOT. [
- 24 INAUDIBLE].



SUP. MOLINA: OKAY THAT'S ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT -- SO --2 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT IS IT? 4 5 SUP. MOLINA: INSTEAD OF PUTTING IT IN FOR THE RESERVE, JUST PUT IT IN FOR THE LIFEGUARDS. 6 7 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I -- YEAH, FOR THE SAKE OF THE -- WHY DON'T WE JUST DO IT THAT WAY. 10 11 SUP. MOLINA: DAVID? 12 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE P.F.U.'S DOWN AT THE RESERVE? 14 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE P.F.U. -- THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE 16 P.F.U. IS --17 18

19

20

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT DOES P.F.U. STAND FOR?

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: PROVISIONAL FINANCING UNIT, IT IS A BUDGET
- 22 UNIT THAT WE PUT SPECIFIC PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS INTO THAT THE
- 23 BOARD HAS NOT YET ACTED ON. FOR EXAMPLE WE HAVE \$17 MILLION IN
- 24 PROVISIONAL FINANCING FOR L.A.C.U.S., WHICH IS THE COUNTY-WIDE
- 25 AUTOMATED SYSTEM. WE'RE NOT PREPARED TO SPEND THAT MONEY YET



- 1 BUT WE ARE IDENTIFYING FOR THAT PURPOSE. IT WILL TAKE THREE
- 2 VOTES TO MOVE A -- TO MOVE MONEY OUT OF A P.F.U. IT WILL TAKE
- 3 FOUR VOTES TO MOVE MONEY OUT OF RESERVE. SO IT'S ESSENTIALLY A
- 4 VOTE ISSUE.

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: AND I UNDERSTAND, BUT AGAIN, IT MAKES SENSE
- 7 BECAUSE YOU'RE NOT, FOR EXAMPLE IN THE LITIGATION IT WASN'T
- 8 ALLOCATED TO BE UTILIZED FOR ANYTHING SO IT'S A GOOD USE. ON
- 9 THE L.A.C.U.S. THING THIS IS MONEY THAT COULD BE RESTORED BACK
- 10 INTO THAT P.F.U. IN A TIME COMING OR HOPEFULLY WHEN IT'S NOT
- 11 NEEDED. SO THAT'S ALL I'M SAYING ON THAT.

12

- 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. OKAY, NOW. WE'RE PUTTING -- IS,
- 14 THERE'S NO OBJECTION THIS IS GOING INTO THE RESERVE FOR BUDGET
- 15 UNCERTAINTIES. IS THERE ANY OBJECTION TO THAT?

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO, I THINK WHAT WE WERE GOING TO DO IS
- 18 WE'RE GOING TO -- WE'RE GOING TO USE IT FOR THE LIBRARY -- NOT
- 19 FOR THE LIBRARY, FOR THE LIFEGUARDS.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: FOR THE LIFEGUARD, OKAY, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
- 22 CHANGE YOUR MOTION?

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'LL CHANGE IT.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT SECOND. WITHOUT OBJECTION, THEN,
- 2 THIS WILL COME --.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT IF THIS HAD BEEN A \$6.5 MILLION ITEM WE
- 5 WOULD'VE BEEN LOOKING TO SOME OTHER FUND -- I JUST WANT TO BE
- 6 CLEAR THAT THERE'S NOT -- THIS IS NOT A PRECEDENT, THIS IS
- 7 JUST THAT WE HAVE THE DISCRETION HERE BECAUSE OF THE AMOUNT.

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, \$650 WILL BE USED TO FUND THE
- 10 LIBRARY -- THE LIFEGUARDS AND \$100 WILL GO WHERE?

11

12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 125, 000 WOULD --

13

14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: DESIGNATION FOR BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTIES.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT 125,000 OKAY, WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 17 SO ORDERED. THE NEXT ITEM WAS ONE OF MINE, WAS THE \$375,000,
- 18 AND THIS SHOULD COME -- THIS WOULD HAVE TO COME OUT OF THE
- 19 FINANCING ELEMENT. I WOULD SO MOVE.

20

21 **SUP. ANTONOVICH: SECOND.**

22

23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE OBJECTION?

24

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHICH ITEM IS THIS I'M SORRY?



```
1
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ONE OBJECTION?
2
3
    SUP. MOLINA: YEAH THERE'S --
4
5
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHICH ITEM?
6
7
8
    SUP. ANTONOVICH: 5.
9
    SUP. MOLINA: AGAIN BECAUSE IT DOESN'T HAVE ANY ALLOCATION OF
10
11
    WHERE IT COMES FROM.
12
13
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHICH ITEM IS THIS?
14
    SUP. ANTONOVICH: 5.
15
16
    SUP. MOLINA: THIS WOULD TAKE IT OUT OF OUR RESERVE CORRECT?
17
18
19
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT WOULD TAKE IT OUT OF THE RESERVE.
20
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IS THIS ITEM NUMBER 7?
21
22
23
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO, NUMBER 5.
24
```



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: THIS DOES NOT TAKE IT OUT OF A P.F.U. IT TAKES IT
- 2 OUT OF RESERVES.

3

4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES.

5

6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, 375,000?

7

8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES.

9

- 10 SUP. KNABE: COULD YOU CLARIFY THE ISSUE OF THE USE OF THE
- 11 F.F.P. ON THIS? IS THAT A DOUBLE HIT TO THE AGENCIES.

12

- 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S NOT -- NO IT'S NOT A DOUBLE HIT TO THE
- 14 AGENCY, YOU MEAN THE DUAL DIAGNOSIS?

15

- 16 SUP. KNABE: NO, I MEAN I KNOW WHAT IT'S BEING USED FOR BUT I
- 17 JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT ONES NOT BEING USED TO OFFSET THE
- 18 OTHER AND THEY'RE GOING TO GET ANOTHER HIT NEXT YEAR.

19

20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THIS IS A ONE TIME.

21

22 SUP. KNABE: ONE TIME STRICTLY OKAY.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT, IN ORDER TO -- FOR THE INSTITUTE.
- 2 ALL RIGHT IS THERE -- WITHOUT -- THERE'S ONE OBJECTION.
- 3 SUPERVISOR MOLINA. HUH?

4

5 SUP. MOLINA: I VOTED NO.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT SUPERVISOR MOLINA VOTES NO. IT'S
- 8 4-1. YEAH. THIS WAS FOR AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, AND IT WAS THE --
- 9 THAT'S A NET COUNTY COST ON IT. I DIDN'T ASK FOR ANYTHING ELSE
- 10 NOW. NUMBER 6 IS THE SHERIFF COPS, AT \$6 MILLION. SUPERVISOR
- 11 KNABE?

12

- 13 SUP. KNABE: I THINK YOU NEED TO HAVE A ROLL CALL ON IT, IT'S
- 14 BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED ROLL CALL.

17

18 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: NO.

21

22 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY:

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO.



CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR KNABE? 2 SUP. KNABE: AYE. 3 4 5 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH: 6 7 SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH: AYE. 8 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND SUPERVISOR BURKE? 10 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO. 12 13 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND MADAM CHAIR THE MOTION FAILS. 14 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE MOTION FAILS. PROBATION, SUPERVISOR 16 ANTONOVICH? 17 18 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THIS IS THE MOTION TO RETAIN CAMP ROCKY AND 19 OPERATION REED FUNDED BY THE ANTICIPATED B.T.U. OR D.B.U. 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT COULD WE GET SOME EXPLANATION OF 21 22 WHERE THE MONEY WILL COME FOR THIS? HOW MUCH OF IT IS READ AND 23 HOW MUCH IS CAMP ROCKY? 24



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE COST TO REINSTATE OPERATION REED IS
- 2 \$400,000, CAMP ROCKY, \$2,225,000. AND THE MONEY IS --

3

4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT DOESN'T ADD UP. THAT'S 2 MILLION-6.

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND PUBLIC DEFENDERS POST -- DISPOSITION
- 7 PROGRAM IS THE THIRD PIECE OF THAT.

8

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WHAT? THE PUBLIC?

10

- 11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S POST DISPOSITION
- 12 PROGRAM. MY SHEET DOESN'T ADD UP TO \$3.3 MILLION. [MIXED
- 13 VOICES].

14

15 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHY DON'T YOU COME UP, RICHARD.

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YEAH.

- 19 SUP. MOLINA: WHILE THEY'RE COMING UP, COULD I ASK ON THE
- 20 PROJECT READ OR OPERATION READ, THERE IS A LOT OF UNEVENNESS
- 21 WITH REGARD TO THIS PROGRAM. IT IS SOMETHING THAT WHEN
- 22 PRESENTED IT WAS GOING TO BE BETTER IMPLEMENTED THAN IT HAS
- 23 BEEN TO DATE. I THINK THAT WE SHOULD PUT THAT MONEY ON HOLD
- 24 AND KEEP IT WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT AND WE NEED A REPORT ABOUT
- 25 BETTER IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT READ. AND IF WE COULD HAVE IT



- 1 LIKE NEXT WEEK OR IN TWO WEEKS, THEN WE COULD PUT IN A VOTE TO
- 2 GET THAT MONEY BACK IN THERE. I DON'T MIND THE ALLOCATION OF
- 3 THE DEPARTMENT, BUT I'M ASKING THAT IT BE RESERVED AND NOT BE
- 4 UTILIZED IN THE NEW FISCAL YEAR UNTIL WE GET AN UPDATED REPORT
- 5 TO LOOK AT MORE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT THAT'S ON THE 400,000 OPERATION
- 8 READ. I'LL SECOND THAT AMENDMENT. NOW WHAT ABOUT THE
- 9 ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC -- I MEAN THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S PROGRAM,
- 10 POST-DISPOSITION. I'D LIKE TO HEAR WHAT THAT'S ABOUT.

11

- 12 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: SUPERVISOR, THAT'S A \$340,000 ALLOCATION TO
- 13 SIX -- FOUR SOCIAL WORKERS WHO OPERATE IN CAMPS AND THEY
- 14 IDENTIFY YOUNGSTERS WHO WOULD BE BETTER-SERVED BY BEING
- 15 RETURNED TO COURT AND SUITABLY PLACED. SO THAT HAS BEEN A VERY
- 16 EFFECTIVE OPERATION. I THINK 98% OF THEIR REFERRALS BACK TO
- 17 COURT HAVE BEEN REMOVED FROM CAMP AND APPROPRIATELY PLACED.
- 18 THE PUBLIC DEFENDER FEELS VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THIS PROGRAM.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: WHAT DO YOU MEAN? WHERE ARE THEY PLACED?

21

- 22 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: IN SUITABLE PLACEMENTS, OR ALTERNATIVES TO
- 23 CAMP, SUPERVISOR MOLINA.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: BUT YOU HAD TWO OF YOUR KIDS SHOWING UP AT OUR
- 2 COMMAND POST, YOU RELEASED THEM AT MIDNIGHT. WHY DIDN'T THAT
- 3 SOCIAL WORKER FIND A SUITABLE PLACEMENT FOR THEM?

4

- 5 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: SUPERVISOR MOLINA, THAT TRANSPIRED BECAUSE
- 6 THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY REJECTED THE COURT FILING AND THEY WERE
- 7 NOT PROBATION, THEY WERE NOT 600 MINORS. SO UNDER THE
- 8 AGREEMENT THAT WE HAVE, WE --.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: AGREEMENT WITH WHO?

11

- 12 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: WITH THE DEPARTMENT, WITH CHILDREN'S
- 13 SERVICES. THE PROTOCOLS WE CALL THE SOCIAL WORKER --

14

15 SUP. MOLINA: YOU RELEASE THEM AT MIDNIGHT?

16

- 17 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: NO, MA'AM, BUT WE CALL THE SOCIAL WORKERS IF
- 18 WE CANNOT FIND A PARENT OR A RELATIVE. WE CAN SIMPLY NOT
- 19 RELEASE THEM OUT THE DOOR. SO WHAT WE DO IS WE TRY TO LOCATE A
- 20 RESPONSIBLE ADULT, A RELATIVE --.

21

- 22 SUP. MOLINA: AND SO HOW MANY DAYS BEFOREHAND ARE YOU SUPPOSED
- 23 TO CALL THAT SOCIAL WORKER? SHE DID NOT RETURN YOUR PHONE CALL
- 24 FOR THOSE TWO KIDS?



- 1 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: WELL THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, IT'S EITHER A
- 2 COURT DISMISSAL OF A CASE OR A DISTRICT ATTORNEY REJECT AND WE
- 3 TRY TO PROMPTLY LOCATE A RELATIVE, WHEN WE DO NOT, THEN WE
- 4 INITIATE THE PROTOCOLS, WE CALL A SOCIAL WORKER. IF THAT FAILS
- 5 THEN WE DELIVER THE YOUNGSTER TO THE COMMAND CENTER. BUT THIS
- 6 PROGRAM IS A PUBLIC DEFENDER PROGRAM, THEY EVALUATE MINORS WHO
- 7 ARE ALREADY IN THE CAMP SYSTEM AS OPPOSED TO --

8

9 SUP. MOLINA: BUT YOU SAID SOCIAL WORKERS.

10

11 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: I'M SORRY, SOCIAL WORKERS.

12

13 SUP. MOLINA: THEY ARE SOCIAL WORKERS?

14

15 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES MA-AM.

16

- 17 SUP. MOLINA: SO THAT'S WHY I'M SAYING IN THIS INSTANCE YOU
- 18 WOULD NOT HAVE -- THESE KIDS WOULD NOT HAVE QUALIFIED FOR THAT
- 19 PROGRAM?

- 21 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: NO MA'AM, IN THIS -- IN THESE -- IN THE
- 22 INSTANCE OF THE YOUNGSTERS THEY ARE NOT ON PROBATION, SO WE
- 23 MUST LOCATE A RESPONSIBLE ADULT O HAVE CHILDREN'S SERVICES
- 24 IDENTIFY AN APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT FOR THEM PENDING AN



- 1 EVALUATION OF THE HOME, WE CAN'T RELEASE THEM OUT THE DOOR.
- 2 THAT WOULD BE UNSAFE.

3

- 4 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY, TELL ME TWO THINGS, RICHARD. LET'S START
- 5 AGAIN. THESE -- THE TWO KIDS THAT YOU RELEASED DID NOT FIT
- 6 INTO THIS PROGRAM BECAUSE YOU SAID THEY WEREN'T ON PROBATION.
- 7 THAT WHAT YOU SAID?

8

9 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM.

10

- 11 SUP. MOLINA: SO HOW DID THEY GET IN TO YOUR PROBATION
- 12 DEPARTMENT?

13

14 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: THEY WERE ARRESTED.

15

- 16 SUP. MOLINA: AND THE D.A.'S DECIDED NOT TO FILE CHARGES OR
- 17 WHAT?

18

- 19 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM, OR THEY WERE DETERMINED TO HAVE
- 20 NO GUILT BY THE COURTS. IN THAT CASE WE STILL HAVE A YOUNGSTER
- 21 -- IF THERE IS NOT A PARENT THERE WE HAVE TO FIND A
- 22 APPROPRIATE PLACE FOR THAT YOUNGSTER TO GO.

23

24 SUP. MOLINA: WHEN DO YOU START DOING IT?



- 1 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: AS SOON AS THERE'S A DISTRICT ATTORNEY
- 2 REJECT, AND WE TRY TO FIND A RESPONSIBLE ADULT. WE DO NOT KNOW
- 3 WHICH --.

4

- 5 SUP. MOLINA: SO LET'S SAY THAT TODAY, RIGHT NOW, THERE IS A
- 6 CASE IN WHICH THERE IS A JUVENILE THAT THE D.A. HAS DECIDED
- 7 NOT TO FILE OR THE COURT FINDS NOT GUILTY, YOU WILL RELEASE
- 8 THEM TODAY, EVEN IF YOU FIND THAT THERE IS NO PARENT, OR
- 9 ANYTHING ELSE, YOU WILL RELEASE THEM TO THE COMMAND POST?

10

11 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM.

12

- 13 SUP. MOLINA: YOU WILL NOT MAKE -- THE SOCIAL WORKER IS
- 14 CONTACTED AND BOTH OF YOU DON'T TRY AND FIND A PLACEMENT FOR
- 15 THIS KID?

16

- 17 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: NO, WE DO CONTACT THE SOCIAL WORKER AND THE
- 18 SOCIAL WORKER WILL DO AS WE HAVE DONE, ATTEMPT TO FIND A
- 19 RESPONSIBLE ADULT. IF NOT, THEN THEY'LL HAVE TO TEMPORARILY
- 20 PLACE THEM PENDING A DISPOSITION IN THE CASE.

- 22 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. IF I REMEMBER WE DID AN M.O.U. WHERE
- 23 THERE WAS SOME KIND OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE
- 24 DEPARTMENT AND THE SOCIAL WORKERS IN WHICH THERE WAS A
- 25 PROTOCOL THAT NEEDED TO BE FOLLOWED.



2 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM.

3

1

- 4 SUP. MOLINA: AND I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT THAT WAS NOT FOLLOWED
- 5 FOR THESE TWO KIDS.

6

7 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, IT WAS.

8

9 SUP. MOLINA: NO, IT WASN'T.

10

- 11 SPEAKER: SUPERVISOR, I THINK THAT THE ELEMENT THAT WAS NOT
- 12 INCLUDED IN THE M.O.U. WAS A SPECIFIC TIME FRAME FROM A POINT,
- 13 A DECISION FOR THE D.A. REJECT TO THE TIME THAT THE SOCIAL
- 14 WORKER SHOULD HAVE BEEN CALLED. AND WE DELAYED THAT
- 15 UNNECESSARILY. SO THAT WAS NOT IN THE M.O.U. WE WILL PUT THAT
- 16 IN THE M.O.U. TO MAKE IT CLEARER.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: I MEAN YOU ALL KNOW, BETTER THAN ANYONE ELSE, WHO
- 19 YOU'RE GOING TO RELEASE. AND MR. SCHUMSKY, YOU AND I DISCUSSED
- 20 THIS IN DETAIL AND YOU HAD A REAL PROBLEM ACCEPTING IT THE
- 21 LAST TIME. IF THERE ARE PITFALLS IN THIS THING IN WHICH WE'RE
- 22 ENDANGERING CHILDREN THEN YOU SHOULD HELP TO FIX IT INSTEAD OF
- 23 JUST THROWING KIDS INTO A COMMAND POST THEY'RE ILL-PREPARED TO
- 24 ACCEPT THEM.



- 1 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: NO MA'AM WE DO, AND IF THERE HAS BEEN A
- 2 MISTAKE IN THE PROCESS --

3

- 4 SUP. MOLINA: NO, YOU DON'T, THIS IS THE MISTAKE THAT WAS MADE
- 5 WITH THOSE TWO KIDS.

6

- 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: MADAM CHAIR, CAN WE JUST MOVE CAMP ROCKY AND
- 8 HAVE A REPORT BACK ON THIS PARTICULAR ITEM?

9

- 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL IT'S, YEAH LET'S -- AND WELL, I THINK
- 11 WE HAVE ONE OTHER WE SHOULD TAKE UP AT THE SAME TIME, WHICH IS
- 12 --

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: WELL AGAIN, I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THE ALLOCATION
- 15 OF THESE DOLLARS, BUT I'M VERY CONCERNED THAT THEY'RE NOT
- 16 GOING TO BE UTILIZED IN A WAY THAT'S PROTECTING AND THESE
- 17 CHILDREN THEN WE ARE UTILIZING THIS MONEY FOR I DON'T KNOW
- 18 WHAT. WHEREAS HERE ARE VERY NEEDY KIDS THAT GOT DROPPED BY THE
- 19 DEPARTMENT INTO THE LAP OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES INSTEAD OF
- 20 BEING PREPARED FOR A PLACEMENT FOR THIS CHILD. THAT'S WHAT
- 21 THIS IS SUPPOSED TO BE ABOUT.

- 23 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM, BUT LEST YOU BELIEVE THIS WAS A
- 24 FAULT OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S PROGRAM, THIS IS DEFINITELY A
- 25 SEPARATE PROGRAM. THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SOCIAL WORKERS --



1

- 2 SUP. MOLINA: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO
- 3 POINT OUT. HERE YOU'RE CREATING A SEPARATE PROGRAM AND WE'RE
- 4 FUNDING A SEPARATE PROGRAM, WHEN YOU HAVE A PROGRAM HERE IN
- 5 WHICH WE NEED TO HAVE -- WE HAVE TWO DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE
- 6 RESPONSIBLE FOR THESE KIDS, BUT BECAUSE YOU DON'T HAVE A
- 7 PROGRAM, LET'S JUST DROP THE KID ON HIS HEAD AND DROP HIM OVER
- 8 AT THE COMMAND POST. THAT'S ALL I'M SAYING TO YOU.

9

10 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES MA-AM.

11

12 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, AND I THINK THAT --.

13

- 14 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHY DON'T WE APPROVE THE ITEM AND HAVE A
- 15 REPORT BACK ON THE OPERATION --

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: LET'S HAVE -- I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE A
- 18 REPORT BACK ON THAT ITEM. I'D ALSO LIKE TO ASK YOU THOUGH
- 19 ABOUT THE SCHOOL-BASED DEPUTY PROBATION OFFICERS, THAT'S A
- 20 MILLION-1. AND WHERE ARE YOU PROPOSING THE FUNDS COME FOR
- 21 THAT?

22

- 23 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WELL THAT WOULD BE FROM THE BUDGET
- 24 UNCERTAINTY PORTION OF THE COUNTY BUDGET.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT IF THERE ARE OTHER QUESTIONS
- 2 ABOUT THE PROBATION OFFICERS ARE SCHOOL BASED?

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, YES WE HAVE A MOTION TOMORROW FOR THE 600
- 5 --

6

7 SUP. MOLINA: WHICH PART WAS COMING FROM THE UNCERTAINTIES?

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S NUMBER 10 AND I'VE JUST -- I THINK
- 10 WE SHOULD DO ALL THE PROBATION AT ONE TIME INSTEAD OF DIVIDING
- 11 IT ALL UP. WE HAD DONE --.

12

13 SUP. MOLINA: AND NOW YOU'RE ON NUMBER 10?

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YES, I BROUGHT 10 UP THERE BECAUSE I THINK
- 16 IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ALONG WITH NUMBER 7.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: BUT WAIT A MINUTE. AS I UNDERSTAND, NUMBER 7
- 19 COMES FROM MONEY, IT HAS MONEY ATTACHED TO IT. I'D LIKE TO
- 20 TREAT IT SEPARATELY BECAUSE THESE ARE FUNDS THAT AS I
- 21 UNDERSTAND ARE GOING TO BE COMING TO THE DEPARTMENT, RIGHT, OR
- 22 WE'RE LETTING YOU KEEP THE SET OF FUNDS, IS WHAT WE'RE DOING.

23

24 RICHARD SCHUMSKY: YES, MA'AM.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: AND IT'S ALLOCATED SPECIFICALLY TO THIS PROGRAM.
- 2 SO I THINK IT'S NOT FAIR TO TREAT THEM ALL TOGETHER 'CAUSE
- 3 THIS ONE HAS AN IDENTIFIABLE FUNDING SOURCE.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, OKAY LET'S FIRST TAKE UP CAMP
- 6 ROCKY THEN. IS THERE A MOTION ON CAMP ROCKY?

7

8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SO MOVED.

9

10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THAT WAS FOR \$2,225,000?

11

12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

13

14 SUP. MOLINA: YOU DIVIDED UP NUMBER 7?

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT YEAH, HE'S BREAKING DOWN THE 3.3
- 17 MILLION.

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL YOU BROUGHT -- FIRST OF ALL YOU SAID
- 20 THE 400,000 YOU WERE GOING TO TREAT SEPARATELY.

21

22 SUP. MOLINA: WELL AGAIN I DIDN'T MEAN TO PUT TO PUT --

23

24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SHE ASKED FOR A REPORT.

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



SUP. ANTONOVICH: SHE JUST WANTS A REPORT ON THAT ISSUE. 1 2 3 SUP. MOLINA: BEFORE THEY START SPENDING IT IN THEIR NEW FISCAL YEAR, THAT'S ALL. 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YOU WANT A REPORT BACK ON THE 400,000 6 7 BEFORE ON -- ON READ, IS IT -- NOT CAMP READ BUT ON PROJECT 8 READ. 9 RICHARD SHUMSKY: OPERATION READ, YES MA'AM, AND I THINK THAT 10 11 WAS 790,000. 12 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S 790,000, WHICH IS PART OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE MOTION. RIGHT, WHATEVER IT IS, YOU WANT IT 14 15 REPORTED ON. 16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SO IS IT 3.380 TOTAL? 17 18 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT. 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I KNOW, BUT SHE HAD A --21 22 23 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT SHE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A REPORT --

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE REASON I'M DIVIDING THESE UP --



1

- 2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ON HOW OPERATION READ IS GOING TO BE
- 3 OPERATED. AND SHE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A REPORT ON HOW THE POST
- 4 DISPOSITION PROGRAM IS BEING OPERATED, PAST AND FUTURE.

5

6 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

7

8 SUP. MOLINA: YES.

9

- 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, SO WE WERE TAKING THE WHOLE 3
- 11 MILLION AND THREE -- AT ONE TIME? IS THERE A MOTION? A SECOND?

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: PROBATION, CAMP ROCKY.

14

15 **SUP. ANTONOVICH: RIGHT.**

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: CAMP ROCKY, OPERATION READ --

18

19 SPEAKER: POST DISPOSITION.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: POST-DISPOSITION. OKAY, IS THERE OBJECTION?
- 22 FOR THE REPORT BACK. ALL RIGHT. WHILE YOU'RE THERE, LET'S TAKE
- 23 UP THE SCHOOL-BASED PROBATION OFFICERS.



- C.A.O. JANSSEN: WHAT I WANTED TO POINT OUT ON THAT SUPERVISOR,
- YOU HAVE AN ITEM BEFORE YOU TOMORROW ON THE AGENDA WHICH WOULD 2
- FUND 660,000 -- 600,000, 600,000 NET OF THE 1.1 MILLION. SO 3
- AND I THINK THAT THERE IS -- I DON'T KNOW THAT THERE'S 4
- 5 OBJECTION TO THAT MOTION TOMORROW. SO IF YOU'RE LOOKING AT
- THIS, YOU SHOULD JUST LOOK AT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN-. 6
- 8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT 500,000?
- C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT. 10

7

9

11

13

15

17

19

23

- SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE A MOTION? 12
- C.A.O. JANSSEN: SO THEN THE MOTION WOULD BE 500,000. 14
- 16 SUP. MOLINA: I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT YOU SAID --
- 18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, WOULD YOU PLEASE REPEAT IT?
- C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, THERE IS AN ITEM ON THE AGENDA, ON YOUR 20
- REGULAR AGENDA TOMORROW, THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT HAS PROPOSED 21
- 22 A WAY TO FUND \$600,000 OF THE SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAM.
- 24 SUP. MOLINA: WHICH DEALS WITH ITEM NUMBER 10?



```
C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT IS CORRECT.
2
3
    SUP. MOLINA: I SEE --
4
5
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: SO YOU'RE -- YEAH.
6
7
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SO THE AMOUNT ON THE MOTION IS 500,000 ONE
8
   HUNDRED --
9
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: 511,000.
10
11
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: 11,000, WITHOUT OBJECTION? OKAY.
12
13
14
    SUP. MOLINA: WAIT, THE SAME QUESTION, I NEED A QUESTION AS TO
    WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM.
15
16
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. ON THE 500 --.
17
18
19
    SUP. MOLINA: ON THE 500,000.
20
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WHERE IS THAT COMING FROM? [ INAUDIBLE ].
21
22
23
    SUP. MOLINA: IS IT COMING FROM THEIR BUDGET?
24
```



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S THE PRIOR YEAR. WE KNOW THAT THERE IS
- 2 \$3.1 MILLION WORTH OF PRIOR YEAR MONEY AVAILABLE FOR PROBATION
- 3 DEPARTMENT. IT COULD EASILY BE \$4.7 MILLION. THE 5 --

4

5 SUP. MOLINA: BUT ISN'T THAT WHERE THE OTHER MONEY CAME FROM?

6

- 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, THE \$3.3 MILLION CAME OUT OF THAT
- 8 POTENTIAL POT OF \$4.7 MILLION.

9

- 10 SUP. MOLINA: THEN I WANT IT TO BE CLEAR IN THE MOTION I DON'T
- 11 HAVE ANY PROBLEM SUPPORTING IT, WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT BUDGET.

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

14

15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT DEPARTMENT BUDGET.

16

17 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SO MOVED.

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED, IS THERE ANY
- 20 OBJECTION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, ITEM 10 IS APPROVED. ALL RIGHT,
- 21 THEN WE'RE COMING BACK -- THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

22

23 SPEAKER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND WE'LL NOW GO TO ITEM 8, WHICH IS THE
- 2 DISTRICT ATTORNEY. FAMILY VIOLENCE AND SEX CRIMES.

3

4 SUP. KNABE: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED, ROLL CALL I GUESS.

5

- 6 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT IS THERE ANY -- AND THIS IS
- 7 COMING OUT OF P.F.U., RIGHT?

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS WOULD -- NO IT SHOULD COME OUT OF
- 10 FINANCING ELEMENTS, OR IT SHOULD COME OUT OF THE RESERVE.

11

12 SUP. MOLINA: THIS HAS TO -- THERE IS NO P.F.U.

13

14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT.

15

16 SUP. KNABE: THAT MAKE IT A FOUR VOTE?

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, IT'S STILL THREE VOTES, THIS IS -- ALL
- 19 THESE ARE THREE VOTES, IT DOESN'T MATTER WHERE.

20

21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.

22

- 23 SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT NOW THERE'S NO P.F.U. COMES OUT OF THE
- 24 RESERVE.



```
SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, CALL THE ROLL.
2
3
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA?
4
5
    SUP. MOLINA: NO.
6
7
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT ITEM ARE WE ON?
8
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE'RE ON THE DISTRICT FAMILY VIOLENCE --
10
11
    SPEAKER: NUMBER 8.
12
13
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: NUMBER 8.
14
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND SEX CRIMES, DO YOU WANT TO DIVIDE THEM
15
16
    OR DO YOU WANT TO TAKE THEM BOTH AT THE SAME TIME? TAKE THEM
    BOTH AT THE SAME TIME, ALL RIGHT. IT'S A ROLL CALL.
17
18
19
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA VOTED NO, SUPERVISOR
20
    YAROSLAVSKY?
21
22
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO.
23
    CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR KNABE.
24
25
```

25

THEY'RE PROVIDING.

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



SUP. KNABE: AYE. 1 2 3 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH? 4 5 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AYE. 6 7 **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS:** AND SUPERVISOR BURKE? 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO. 10 11 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: THE MOTION FAILS. 12 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NUMBER 9 IS SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY'S MOTION TO FREEZE ALL ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY MOTION TODAY 14 BEGINNING OCTOBER 1ST. 15 16 SUP. MOLINA: SECOND. 17 18 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WITHOUT OBJECTION SO ORDERED. ITEM 11 IS 20 THE CORONER, DISASTER SERVICE, 103,000. 21 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHAT I WOULD ALSO SUGGEST MR. JANSSEN IS THAT 22 23 THIS ALSO BE ONE OF THOSE THAT WE ASK FOR REIMBURSEMENT FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ON THEIR BIOTERRORISM GRANT THAT 24



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: LET ME ASK, SHARON, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU'VE
- 3 LOOKED AT THIS, BUT WE'VE HAD THREE SEPARATE MEETINGS
- 4 ALLOCATING FEDERAL DOLLARS. AND PART OF THOSE WENT TO THE
- 5 CORONER'S OFFICE. SO IS THIS ALREADY TAKEN CARE OF IN PART OF
- 6 THOSE ALLOCATIONS? [INAUDIBLE].

7

8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: DOES DR. LECHER OR TONY HERNANDEZ?

9

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IS TONY HERE, OH HE WOULD KNOW. TONY ARE THESE
- 11 IN ADDITION TO WHAT YOU'VE RECEIVED FROM THE -- IT'S IN
- 12 ADDITION TO AND IT CAME OUT OF WHERE BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T ASK
- 13 THE COMMITTEE FOR IT.

14

15 ANTHONY HERNANDEZ: YEAH, JUST SO I COULD EXPLAIN THE --

16

17 SUP. ANTONOVICH: GIVE YOUR NAME FIRST.

- 19 ANTHONY HERNANDEZ: ANTHONY HERNANDEZ, CORONER'S OFFICE.
- 20 ESSENTIALLY WHAT TOOK PLACE WAS THIS WAS ORIGINALLY PART OF
- 21 THE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT REQUEST. HOWEVER THERE WAS A
- 22 CATCH-22 WITH THAT, IN THAT THE MANDATE FOR THE TRAINING WAS
- 23 THAT IT BE PERFORMED ON THE FEDERAL BASE OVER IN FORT
- 24 MCLELLAN, ALABAMA. THE PROBLEM WITH THAT IS THAT IN ORDER TO
- 25 FULLY TRAIN THE 18 SELECTED INDIVIDUALS IT WOULD COST OVER



- 1 \$140,000 FOR TRAVEL THE COSTS ALONE. SO WE FELT IT WOULD BE
- 2 MORE APPROPRIATE TO BACK OUT OF THAT AND ONLY REQUEST FOR THE
- 3 ACTUAL TRAINING ASPECT OF IT AND THERE'S ANOTHER PORTION OF
- 4 THIS REQUEST THAT DOESN'T ADDRESS -- IT'S NOT ADDRESSED IN ANY
- 5 OF THE GRANTS, WHICH IS PREPARATION FOR ACTUAL AUTOPSY AND
- 6 EXAMINATIONS OF CONTAMINATED CASES IN OUR CORONER'S FACILITY.
- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.
- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY DIDN'T YOU ASK THE C.A.O. FOR IT IN THE
- 11 BUDGET -- IN YOUR BUDGET DISCUSSIONS?
- 13 ANTHONY HERNANDEZ: BECAUSE ORIGINALLY IT WAS BEING ADDRESSED
- 14 IN THE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT. AND THAT'S -- AND AT THAT
- 15 POINT, AT BUDGET -- DURING THE BUDGET HEARINGS AND MEETINGS,
- 16 WE WEREN'T EVEN AT BASE ONE. RIGHT NOW WHAT WE HAVE IS
- 17 ALLOCATIONS FROM THIS GRANT WHICH PROVIDE US WITH THE
- 18 APPROPRIATE SAFETY EOUIPMENT AND GEAR TO RESPOND TO THE AT
- 19 SCENE POTENTIAL DISASTER. HOWEVER, YOU HAVE TO BE -- THE CATCH
- 20 TO THAT IS YOU HAVE TO BE TRAINED FOR IT. IF YOU'RE NOT
- 21 TRAINED FOR IT, YOU CAN'T USE THE EQUIPMENT. SO THE ALLOCATION
- 22 PART HAS ALREADY BEEN ADDRESSED BUT YOU HAVE TO HAVE THE LAST
- 23 COMPONENT, WHICH IS THE TRAINING ASPECT.

24

7

9



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT ONCE YOU HAVE THAT, CAN IT COME OUT OF
- 2 THE DISASTER MONEY? IT IS TOO LATE TO GET IT OUT OF THE
- 3 DISASTER MONEY?

4

- 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MAYBE WHAT I COULD SUGGEST IS IF YOU ARE
- 6 INCLINED TO DO THIS, PUT THE 103,000 IN P.F.U. AND WE'LL
- 7 TARGET IT, AND IT CANNOT BE REMOVED UNTIL WE HAVE AN
- 8 OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE A LOOK AT ALL THE GRANTS AND A BETTER WAY
- 9 TO FUND THIS. WE'RE NOT FULLY FAMILIAR WITH THIS, SO IT'S A
- 10 LITTLE BIT OF A SURPRISE. BUT, YOU KNOW, ANYTHING HAVING TO DO
- 11 WITH HOMELAND SECURITY WE'VE BEEN VERY SUPPORTIVE OF. SO PUT
- 12 IN IT P.F.U. AND THEN WE'LL REPORT BACK.

13

14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHY EVEN PUT IT IN, PUT WHAT IN P.F.U.?

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: \$103,000 OUT OF RESERVE, JUST MOVE IT FROM ONE
- 17 FUND TO THE OTHER.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL YOU COULD DO THAT IN TWO WEEKS AFTER
- 20 YOU GET THIS THING RESOLVED.

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YOU CAN, IT'S FOUR VOTES THEN, THAT'S THE ONLY
- 23 DIFFERENCE, WHICH IS FINE, YEAH, AFTER THE BUDGET IS ADOPTED,
- 24 IT WOULD BE FOUR VOTES.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I THOUGHT IT WAS FOUR TO RECOGNIZE NEW
- 2 REVENUE, NOT TO TRANSFER.

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, IT'S FOUR VOTES TO TAKE ANYTHING OUT OF A
- 5 RESERVE ALSO, ONCE YOU'VE ADOPTED THE BUDGET. WHICH IS FINE
- 6 BECAUSE I THINK IF WE COME BACK RECOMMENDING IT AND YOU'LL
- 7 HAVE FOUR VOTES, I WOULD PRESUME. SO GIVEN THAT WE DON'T NEED
- 8 TO DO IT. I'LL JUST COME BACK AND DO IT AT --.

9

- 10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YOU NEVER KNOW YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE FOUR
- 11 VOTES, FIVE VOTES, TWO VOTES OR ONE VOTES. I MEAN TO BE
- 12 TRUTHFUL. AND ON THESE TYPES OF --.

13

14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL CAN WE --.

15

- 16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: PROGRAMS YOU NEED THE TRAINING TO BEGIN
- 17 YESTERDAY AND AND -- SO YOUR SUGGESTION IS TO APPROVE THE ITEM
- 18 AND PUT THE MONEY -- WHAT DID YOU SAY, DAVID?

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IN P.F.U.

21

- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IN P.F.U., ALL RIGHT IS THERE A MOTION, IS
- 23 THAT WHAT YOU MOVED?

24

25 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YEAH, I WILL MOVE THAT.



SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A SECOND? ALL RIGHT CALL THE ROLL. SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THIS IS ON MR. ANTONOVICH'S MOTION. SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: TO PUT IT IN P.F.U., AND THEN TO COME BACK. **CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR MOLINA?** SUP. MOLINA: YES. CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY. SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YES. CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR KNABE SUP. KNABE: AYE. CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH? SUP. ANTONOVICH: AYE. CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND SUPERVISOR BURKE?



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AYE.

2

3 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: THE MOTION CARRIES.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THERE'S GOING TO BE A REPORT BACK ON
- 6 WHETHER OR NOT IT'S -- SOME PLACE ELSE WE CAN IDENTIFY THAT.

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: TO FUND IT RIGHT.

9

- 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE NEXT ITEM IS THE MENTAL HEALTH CONTRACT
- 11 PROVIDERS, AND I HAVE TWO MOTIONS, TWO AMENDMENTS, AND WE'LL
- 12 PASS THOSE OUT. THE FIRST ONE IS THAT ONCE THE 4 MILLION SALES
- 13 TAX REALIGNMENT FUNDS ARE REALIZED IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER THE
- 14 BOARD TO RECONSIDER SHIFTING THESE FUNDS IN PLACE OF THE F-MAP
- 15 AND THE F.F.P. AND THE S.A.M.S.A. PATH MONEY. THAT WOULD BE --
- 16 DO YOU ACCEPT THAT MOTION?

17

18 SPEAKER: YEAH THAT'S FINE.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE SECOND WOULD BE TO DIRECT THE
- 21 DEPARTMENT TO REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD IN TWO WEEKS WITH AN
- 22 ACTION PLAN TO ASSIST CONTRACTORS IN SUCCESSFULLY ASSESSING
- 23 THEIR INDIAN CHILDREN CLIENTS FOR A STATE HEALTHY FAMILIES
- 24 PROGRAM.



1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THAT'S FINE, YOU INCLUDE IT IN THE MOTION.

2

- 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BECAUSE THEY REALLY DON'T KNOW HOW MANY OF
- 4 THESE FAMILIES CAN REALLY QUALIFY FOR HEALTHY FAMILIES.

5

6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SO MOVED AS AMENDED.

7

8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL HANG ON. I WANT TO UNDERSTAND THIS.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: WHAT ITEM IS THIS?

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I ABSOLUTELY DO NOT AND I APPRECIATE THAT
- 13 YOU MAY UNDERSTAND IT. I DON'T. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT SOME OF
- 14 THE PROVIDERS ARE NOT FULLY SATISFIED BUT CAN SOMEBODY EXPLAIN
- 15 EXACTLY WHAT THIS -- LET'S START WITH NUMBER ONE.

16

17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MY FIRST AMENDMENT?

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE.

20

21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ONCE THE \$4 MILLION SALES TAX REALIGNMENT
- 24 ARE REALIZED --

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, COULD --1 2 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THE BOARD TO RECONSIDER SHIFTING THESE FUNDS, WHICH FUNDS ARE THESE FUNDS? 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL WE'RE -- PRESENTLY WE'RE TALKING ABOUT 6 7 USING THE F-MAP FUNDS. 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IN PLACE OF THE F-MAP. 10 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT WOULD YOU COME -- WOULD YOU COME FORWARD AND EXPLAIN IT. 12 13 SUP. MOLINA: THE F-MAP MONEYS ARE ONE-TIME MONIES, CORRECT? 14 15 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S RIGHT. 17 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEY MAY BE TWO TIME ACTUALLY. 19 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THEY MAY BE WHAT? 21 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEY MAY BE TWO TIME BUT THEY'RE LIMITED. 23

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHAT THE --

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



- 1 SPEAKER: WITH THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES,
- 2 THE CONCERN WE HAVE IS THAT THIS F.F.P., THE F-MAP MONEY IS
- 3 ADDITIONAL MONEY THAT'S RESULTING FROM AN INCREASE IN THE
- 4 AMOUNT OF F.F.P. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH WILL BE
- 5 GETTING ON A SHORT TERM BASIS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS
- 6 PART OF THE RECENT TAX BAILOUT. AT SOME POINT THAT F.F.P.
- 7 AMOUNT WILL BE REDUCED BACK DOWN TO 50%. SO AT THE TIME IT
- 8 GOES UP TO LET'S SAY 54%, THERE IS SOME -- WHAT THEY WANT TO
- 9 DO IS SHIFT THE C.G.F. SAVINGS OVER TO OFFSET SOME OF THE
- 10 CURTAILMENT. THE PROBLEM IS THAT AT SOME POINT THAT F.F.P.
- 11 WILL BE GOING BACK DOWN TO 50%, AT WHICH TIME YOU'VE TAKEN
- 12 MONEY AWAY FROM SOME PROVIDERS AND THEIR C.G.F. HAS BEEN
- 13 REDUCED, LET'S SAY DOWN TO 46% AND YOU THEN CREATE A GAP A
- 14 YEAR FROM NOW BECAUSE YOUR F.F.P. AMOUNT IS BACK DOWN TO 50%.
- 15 SO BASICALLY WHAT YOU'RE DOING IS YOU'RE PLUGGING ONE HOLE AND
- 16 CREATING ANOTHER HOLE. AND THE F.F.P. THAT TODAY IS AT 50/50,
- 17 MOST OF THAT IS GOING TO ADULT PROVIDERS, A LOT OF IT FOR
- 18 INDIGENT SERVICES. SO THE PROBLEM IS AGAIN, IF YOU'RE AT 50/50
- 19 TODAY, YOU GO TO 54 F.F.P., 46 C.G.F. TO FREE UP SOME OF THOSE
- 20 SAVINGS AS THE OFFSET, WHEN YOU GO BACK A YEAR FROM NOW TO 50%
- 21 F.F.P. YOU STILL HAVE A REDUCED AMOUNT OF C.G.F. SO THE
- 22 CONCERN IS THAT WE WOULD MUCH RATHER USE THE REALIGNMENT
- 23 DOLLARS THAT ARE CLEAN AS OPPOSED TO USING THESE SAVINGS
- 24 GENERATED BY A SHORT-TERM INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF F.F.P.
- 25 DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?



1

- 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH, I -- MR. JANSSEN? WHAT DO YOU MEAN?
- 3 YOU CAN'T JUST, I MEAN THIS -- YOU GOT THE AGENCIES LOBBYING,
- 4 YOU GOT THE DEPARTMENT LOBBYING. WHERE IS -- WHERE IS THE
- 5 RESPONSIBILITY? I WANT TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER THIS IS CRAZY OR
- 6 NOT.

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SUPERVISOR, I DID NOT UNDERSTAND A WORD HE
- 9 SAID.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OH OKAY, THAT'S DIFFERENT, THAT WAS THAT, I
- 12 THOUGHT YOU WERE THROWING YOUR HANDS UP AT ME.

13

- 14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND A WORD HE SAID, I NEED
- 15 TO FIND MY STAFF THAT DOES MENTAL HEALTH, THAT MAY BE
- 16 PERFECTLY FINE BUT IT MADE NO SENSE TO ME.

17

18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, LET'S GET THEM.

19

- 20 SUP. MOLINA: THE WAY IT'S BEEN EXPLAINED TO ME, AND CORRECT ME
- 21 IF I'M WRONG, THAT IS IT'S THIS MONEY WHICH HE IS SAYING NOW,
- 22 INSTEAD OF COMING OUT OF F-MAP AND S.A.M.S.A., WHATEVER ALL
- 23 THESE THINGS ARE, THAT RIGHT NOW WE WOULD TAKE IT OUT OF THIS
- 24 SALES TAX REALIGNMENT FUNDS ONCE IT COMES IN.



1 SPEAKER: THAT'S CORRECT.

2

- 3 SUP. MOLINA: THAT'S WHAT IS BEING SAID. MS. BURKE SAYS TO ME
- 4 THAT WE MAY NEED TO DO -- STILL CONTINUE TO PUT SOME MONEY IN
- 5 FROM SALES TAX REALIGNMENT BECAUSE THERE ARE SOME FAMILIES
- 6 THAT DO NOT QUALIFY FOR THE F. MAP OR THE S.A.M.S.A. MONEY, IS
- 7 THAT CORRECT?

8

- 9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: JUST TO RECONSIDER IT, I'M NOT SAYING TO
- 10 TRANSFER IT, I'M SAYING TO RECONSIDER THE ISSUE.

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: I UNDERSTAND, YOU'RE RECONSIDERING ONCE THE MONEY
- 13 IS REALIZED, THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.

14

- 15 SPEAKER: BUT THOSE ARE SEPARATE ISSUES, THE F.F.P. IS ONLY FOR
- 16 FAMILIES THAT QUALIFY FOR MEDI-CAL, IT DOES NOT COVER ANY
- 17 UNINSURED INDIVIDUALS AT ALL.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO END UP WITH,
- 20 POTENTIALLY, ALL YOU SAID HERE IS RECONSIDER, WHATEVER THAT
- 21 MEANS, IT DOESN'T MEAN YOU HAVE TO ACTUALLY CHANGE WHAT YOU
- 22 WERE DOING. YOU COULD END UP IN A SITUATION WHERE THEY'RE
- 23 GOING TO END UP WITH MORE MONEY THAN THEY STARTED WITH, THAN
- 24 THEY ASKED FOR.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: NO, THAT'S NOT THE WAY -- THAT'S WHY I ASKED THE
- 2 QUESTION.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL THAT'S WHAT THIS SAYS, THAT'S WHAT I
- 5 THINK IT SAYS.

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: WELL THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING FOR THE CLARIFICATION,
- 8 BECAUSE I -- AND THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING, I DON'T HAVE A
- 9 PROBLEM WITH --

10

- 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT THEY SHOULDN'T -- IF THAT'S WHAT IT
- 12 SAYS, THAT'S NOT WHAT WE MEAN.

13

14 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT, THEN LET'S --

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE DON'T MEAN FOR THEM TO GET MORE MONEY.

17

- 18 SPEAKER: NO WE'RE NOT, NO WE'RE ONLY SAYING IF YOU'RE USING AS
- 19 AN OFFSET THE F-MAP DOLLARS THAT YOU'RE SAVING BECAUSE OF THE
- 20 INCREASED AMOUNT OF F.F.P., INSTEAD OF USING THOSE DOLLARS FOR
- 21 THE OFFSET WE WOULD MUCH PREFER USING THE ALIGNMENT MONEY.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH 'CAUSE YOU HAVE TOTAL FLEXIBILITY WITH
- 24 THE REALIGNMENT, BUT YOU MAY NOT GET THE REALIGNMENT, I DON'T
- 25 KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN WITH IT.

6

8

10

12

17

19

23

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1
2 SUP. MOLINA: BUT ZEV THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND.

3 UNDER YOUR MOTION -- IS IT YOUR MOTION?

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO IT'S MS. BURKE'S --
- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO, IT'S ANTONOVICH'S MOTION.
- 9 SUP. MOLINA: MICHAEL'S MOTION.
- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ANTONOVICH AMENDED BY BURKE.
- 13 SUP. MOLINA: AS I UNDERSTAND THE AMENDMENT, ALL IT SAYS IS
- 14 RIGHT NOW THEY'RE USING THESE REALIGNMENT -- THEY ARE USING
- 15 THIS F-MAP AND S.A.M.S.A. DOLLARS UNDER YOUR THING, THEY'RE
- 16 SAYING ONCE WE GET THIS --
- 18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE SALES TAX MONEY, YES.
- 20 SUP. MOLINA: THEN WE WOULD RECONSIDER, OR IF YOU WANT TO PUT A
- 21 STRONGER WORD, WE WOULD CHANGE IT OR WE WOULD SUBSTITUTE THESE
- 22 DOLLARS INSTEAD.
- 24 SPEAKER: THAT'S CORRECT, THE REALIGNMENT MONEY INSTEAD OF THE
- 25 F-MAP DOLLARS.



1
2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YEAH, AND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING YOU DON'T WANT

3 TO DO THAT?

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT WHAT I'M SAYING IS THAT LET -- [MIXED
- 6 VOICES].

7

8 SPEAKER: MAYBE I CAN TRY AND EXPLAIN IT ONE MORE TIME.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO, DON'T TRY TO EXPLAIN IT 'CAUSE IT'S NOT
- 11 DOING ME ANY GOOD. I KNOW WHAT YOU'RE AFTER AND I'M NOT SURE I
- 12 HAVE A DISAGREEMENT WITH WHAT YOU'RE AFTER. I JUST -- BETWEEN
- 13 WHAT YOU'RE AFTER AND WHAT WE'RE SAYING COULD BE TWO DIFFERENT
- 14 THINGS YOU COULD HAVE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES. AND WHAT I'M
- 15 CONCERNED ABOUT, YVONNE, IS THAT THE WAY THIS IS WRITTEN AND
- 16 WHOEVER DRAFTED IT, I'M SURE IT WAS DONE QUICKLY, BUT THE WAY
- 17 IT'S WRITTEN, ALL IT DOES IS SAY YOU ARE GOING TO GET -- WE'RE
- 18 GOING TO DO -- IT IS AN AMENDMENT TO THE
- 19 ANTONOVICH/YAROSLAVSKY MOTION, WHICH GIVES THEM -- FULLY FUNDS
- 20 THE SHORTFALL WHICH IS WHAT KIND OF GETS ME IT'S ALMOST LIKE
- 21 NOTHING WE CAN DO.

22

23 SPEAKER: AND I APPRECIATE THAT BUT --



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT, SO WE FULLY FUNDED YOUR CUTBACK
- 2 AND NOW YOU'D RATHER HAVE FULL FLEXIBILITY, YOU'D RATHER HAVE
- 3 THE REALIGNMENT MONEY THAN THESE SOMEWHAT CONSTRAINED FUNDS. I
- 4 UNDERSTAND WHY.

5

6 **SPEAKER:** YEAH.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BUT WHAT THIS SAYS IS, YOU GET THAT MONEY
- 9 'CAUSE THAT'S AMENDING THE MOTION AND THEN WHEN THE STATE
- 10 REALIGNMENT MONEY COMES IN, THE SALES TAX REALIGNMENT FUNDS
- 11 COME IN,

12

13 SUP. MOLINA: YOU GET THAT, TOO.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL IT SAYS HERE IS THE BOARD TO -- IT'S NOT
- 16 EVEN A COMPLETE SENTENCE. THE BOARD TO RECONSIDER SHIFTING
- 17 THESE FUNDS IN PLACE OF F-MAP, RECONSIDER. WHAT -- IF YOU WANT
- 18 TO DO A ONE OR THE OTHER THEN JUST APPROPRIATE THE MONEY, AS
- 19 THE ANTONOVICH MONEY SAYS WE DO, AND SAY THAT WHEN -- IF AND
- 20 WHEN THE STATE REALIGNMENT FUNDS COMES UP, WILL IT BE
- 21 CALENDARED BEFORE THE BOARD AND THE BOARD AT THAT TIME WILL
- 22 CONSIDER A SWAP INSTEAD OF --.

23

24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL THAT'S -- I THINK THAT'S FINE.



SPEAKER: THAT'S FINE WITH US. 2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S FINE. 3 4 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL THEN MAYBE WE SHOULD TAKE A FEW MINUTES AND JUST REWORD THIS --6 7 8 SPEAKER: AS LONG AS IT'S CONSISTENT WITH THAT THAT'S FINE WITH US, BECAUSE, YOU KNOW --10 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, I HAVE -- I WOULD CERTAINLY 12 AGREE TO THAT. 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND THEN I'D STILL LIKE TO UNDERSTAND WHAT I 14 15 JUST SAID BE -- [LAUGHTER] 16 SPEAKER: WELL LATER I CAN TRY AND EXPLAIN, I DON'T WANT -- IT 17 18 IS VERY TECHNICAL, BUT IT HAS UNINTENDED -- THE F-MAP, USE OF 19 F-MAP FUNDS HAS UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES. 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL AND I THINK THE ONE THING IS THAT AND 21

I CERTAINLY DID NOT INTEND FOR IT TO BE TOO -- FOR IT TO BE

24

22

23

DOUBLE.

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'M SURE YOU DIDN'T, YEAH.

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT --2 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT'S ALL -- ANY WAY, ALL I'M SAYING IS IT 4 5 HAS UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES. BUT THE OTHER THING THE YOU OUGHT TO UNDERSTAND IS THAT IT HAD INTENDED CONSEQUENCES, TOO, WHICH 6 7 IS TO GIVE YOU FOUR SOMETHING --8 9 SPEAKER: AND WE APPRECIATE THAT -- WE APPRECIATE THAT VERY MUCH. BUT WE'RE NOT -- WE'RE NOT, NO WE UNDERSTAND THAT AND WE 10 11 DO APPRECIATE THAT. 12 13 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT THESE OTHER MONIES WERE OWED TO THEM ANYHOW. OKAY. ALL RIGHT BUT WE CAN TAKE YOUR WORDING ON IT AND 14 WE'LL AGREE TO THAT. 15 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: HAVE YOU GOT OTHER STUFF YOU'RE GOING TO DO? 17 18 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THIS IS IT. THE ONLY OTHER MOTION BEFORE US 20 -- NO, THIS IT IS. 21 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO ORDERED? 23 24 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THIS IS THE LAST MOTION.

> The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



SUP. ANTONOVICH: JUST USE THAT MOTION AND REWORD IT. 2 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: JUST GIVE ME TWO MINUTES. 4 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THEN WE'LL SEE WHAT THE C.A.O. COMES BACK WITH. 6 7 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: RIGHT. 9 SUP. MOLINA: IS THIS ON ITEM 12? CAN I ASK A QUESTION? 10 11 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SURE. 12 13 SUP. MOLINA: WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM? 14 15 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHICH ONE? 17 18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL THAT WAS THE WHOLE POINT, I THOUGHT. 19 WE WERE GOING TO USE THE F-MAP. 20 SUP. MOLINA: SINCE WE'RE BACK ON THIS OTHER ONE THEN, THIS IS 21 22 THE LAST ONE, THE ONE WE WERE DISCUSSING. 23

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. NOW WHICH ONE ARE YOU?

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: NO I THOUGHT THIS WAS AN ADDITIONAL ONE, I JUST
- 2 WANTED TO MAKE SURE.

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE MENTAL HEALTH,
- 5 OKAY THE CONTRACT MONEY.

6

7 SUP. MOLINA: I GOT IT.

8

9 SUP. KNABE: MAYBE WE SHOULD DO IT IN RED.

10

11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT'S APPROPRIATE.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT. HERE IS HOW I WOULD WRITE IT OR
- 14 WORD IT. IF -- THE AMENDMENT WOULD READ "IF AND WHEN THE SALES
- 15 TAX REALIGNMENT FUNDS ARE REALIZED, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
- 16 WILL CALENDAR THAT ITEM IN ORDER TO CONSIDER A DOLLAR FOR
- 17 DOLLAR SWAP OF REALIGNMENT FUNDS FOR THE F-MAP FUNDS."

18

19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THAT'S -- THAT'S FINE, ISN'T IT?

20

21 SPEAKER: WE APPRECIATE THAT.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NOW HAVING WRITTEN IT, I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHAT
- 24 THE C.A.O. THINKS, TO MAKE SURE I'M NOT CRAZY.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO ONE'S TRYING TO DO IT TWICE, NO-ONE'S
- 2 TRYING TO DOUBLE-FUND IT.

3

4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT, LET'S JUST --.

5

6 SUP. MOLINA: CAN I ASK A QUICK QUESTION JUST?

7

8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YES.

9

- 10 SUP. MOLINA: WHEN IT'S TAX REALIGNMENT MONEY THAT IS FUNDING
- 11 THIS PROGRAM, WHAT HAPPENS TO THE S.A.M.S.A. AND F-MAP MONIES?

12

13 SPEAKER: THE DEPARTMENT CAN USE THEM AS THEY SEE FIT.

14

15 SUP. MOLINA: ZEV, THAT'S THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION.

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT IS? BUT HE JUST CHANGED IT, HE JUST
- 18 CHANGED IT FOR ONE FOR ONE.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: NO, NO, BUT LISTEN.

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO, NO, WHAT -- HER POINT IS, AND IT'S HIS
- 23 POINT, TOO, THE REASON THEY WANT THE REALIGNMENT MONEY IS THEY
- 24 HAVE REALLY FREE REIN ON HOW TO USE THE MONEY. THE MONEY THAT



- 1 WE WERE -- THAT MR. ANTONOVICH AND MY MOTION OFFERED UP HAS
- 2 STRINGS ATTACHED TO IT.

3

- 4 SPEAKER: IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT, AND LET ME TRY ONE MORE TIME
- 5 AND IF I CAN'T CLARIFY IT THEN, YOU KNOW.

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: BUT THE DIFFERENCE -- WAIT A MINUTE. THAT'S ONE
- 8 CLARIFICATION. THE POINT THAT I'M TRYING TO MAKE IS THAT IS --
- 9 I DON'T WANT TO SAY DOUBLE-DIPPING, THAT'S AN UNFAIR THING,
- 10 BUT THIS IS --

11

- 12 SPEAKER: WE CERTAINLY ARE NOT TRYING -- NO WE'RE CERTAINLY NOT
- 13 TRYING TO DO THAT, AND LET ME TRY --

14

- 15 SUP. MOLINA: WELL THAT'S WHY I ASKED. WHAT HAPPENS TO THAT
- 16 MONEY?

17

18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: TO THE F-MAP MONEY.

19

- 20 SPEAKER: IT WOULD HAVE TO GO BACK AND BE SHIFTED BACK TO THE
- 21 DEPARTMENT. I MEAN THE DEPARTMENT REALLOCATES MONEY ALL THE --
- 22 .

23

24 SUP. MOLINA: SHIFT BACK TO THE DEPARTMENT?



- 1 SPEAKER: IT'D BE PART OF THEIR BUDGET, I MEAN THEY SHIFT MONEY
- 2 AROUND ALL THE TIME.

3

- 4 SUP. MOLINA: SO THIS IS -- THAT WOULD BE AN INCREASE TO THE
- 5 MENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET.

- 7 SPEAKER: WELL CAN I JUST CLARIFY THE ONE -- GOING BACK TO THE
- 8 50/50 AGAIN. TODAY THERE'S 50/50 MATCH. 50/50 SPLIT. \$50 IN
- 9 C.G.F. LET'S SAY AND \$50 IN F.F.P. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS
- 10 PROPOSING ON A SHORT TERM BASIS TO GO TO 54%, AND THEN DOWN
- 11 SLIGHTLY -- BUT FOR EASE OF ARGUMENT, LET'S SAY IT'S UP TO 54%
- 12 FOR A YEAR'S PERIOD OF TIME. AT THE TIME THE F.F.P. GOES UP TO
- 13 54%, THE COUNTY ONLY NEEDS 46% OF THE DOLLARS. SO THAT FREES
- 14 UP 4%. AT SOME POINT -- AND THE ONLY WAY THAT YOU CAN USE THAT
- 15 MONEY IS TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF C.G.F. IN SOMEONE'S CONTRACT
- 16 AND SHIFT IT SOMEWHERE ELSE, OKAY. SO YOU'VE SHIFTED THE
- 17 REALLOCATION IN THEIR CONTRACT. THEY'RE WHOLE FOR A YEAR, HAVE
- 18 54%, F.F.P., THEY HAVE 46%, C.G.F. FOR A YEAR, AND AS LONG AS
- 19 THEY'VE INCREASED UP THE F.F.P. FOR THAT PERIOD OF TIME. A
- 20 YEAR FROM NOW LET'S SAY, THE F.F.P. GOES BACK DOWN TO 50% BUT
- 21 THE AGENCY THAT'S GIVEN THAT MONEY, MOST OF WHICH ARE ADULT
- 22 PROVIDERS, NOW STILL ONLY HAVE THAT 46% OF C.G.F. IN THEIR
- 23 CONTRACT. SO A YEAR FROM NOW THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE OF
- 24 WHAT'S BEING PROPOSED IS THAT THERE ARE A CERTAIN GROUP OF
- 25 PROVIDERS, PRIMARILY ADULT PROVIDERS PROVIDING INDIGENT



- 1 SERVICE AND OTHERS, THAT WILL ONLY HAVE 46% C.G.F. IN THEIR
- 2 CONTRACT. SO IF THE DEPARTMENT HAD A WAY AT SOME POINT OF
- 3 REASSURING THAT AGENCIES THAT ARE SHIFTING THIS MONEY WERE
- 4 HELD WHOLE A YEAR FROM NOW WHEN THE F.F.P. GOES BACK TO 50% IT
- 5 WOULDN'T BE AN ISSUE. THE PROBLEM IS THOUGH, THE F.F.P. AMOUNT
- 6 WILL GO DOWN AND THE AGENCIES WILL HAVE HAD LESS C.G.F.
- 7 BECAUSE THAT AMOUNT OF C.G.F. SAVINGS THAT THEY'VE INCURRED
- 8 HAS BEEN SHIFTED TO FILL THIS OTHER HOLE. DOES THAT MAKE SOME
- 9 SENSE?

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL IT MAKES SOME SENSE FROM YOUR POINT OF
- 12 VIEW, BUT WHY DO YOU THINK THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHOULD BE
- 13 ABLE TO GUARANTEE A YEAR AHEAD OF TIME THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE
- 14 HELD HARMLESS --

15

16 SPEAKER: NO I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT THE POINT IS IF --

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT'S NOT SOMETHING I WOULD BE PREPARED TO
- 19 DO.

- 21 SPEAKER: I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT THE POINT IS TO THE EXTENT THE
- 22 COUNTY HAS THESE REALIGNMENT DOLLARS, WHICH WE HAD UNDERSTOOD
- 23 FROM E-MAILS FROM THE DEPARTMENT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO USE AS
- 24 AN OFF-SET AND THAT WAS OUR UNDERSTANDING THAT WE WOULD HAVE
- 25 THOSE DOLLARS AVAILABLE. WE'RE CERTAINLY OBVIOUSLY SAYING WE'D



- 1 MUCH RATHER HAVE THOSE REALIGNMENT DOLLARS. 'CAUSE THAT WAS
- 2 OUR UNDERSTANDING.

3

4 SUP. ANTONOVICH: CAN WE JUST GET DAVID'S TAKE ON THIS?

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK -- IT SEEMS TO ME THE ISSUE IS CAPPING
- 7 THE RESTORATION AT 4.6 -- AT 4.630, THAT'S THE FIRST THING. AS
- 8 LONG AS IT IS CAPPED, PERIOD. THAT'S THE FIRST THING IT SEEMS
- 9 TO ME. AND THEN YOU TALK ABOUT HOW THEN ARE YOU GOING TO
- 10 RESTORE THE MONEY? AND WHAT I HEAR THEM SAYING IS, THERE IS
- 11 ESTIMATED TO BE \$4 MILLION FROM PRIOR YEAR REALIGNMENT MONIES
- 12 THAT'LL BE AVAILABLE, IT'S ONE-TIME MONEY. SO THEY WANT TO
- 13 TAKE PART OF THAT AND THE F-MAP INCREASE TO REDUCE --

14

- 15 SPEAKER: WE WOULD PREFER NOT TO USE ANY OF THE -- OUR PROPOSAL
- 16 --

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I UNDERSTAND, I UNDERSTAND --

19

20 SPEAKER: WAS ALL \$4 MILLION --

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: BECAUSE THAT F-MAP NOT EVERYBODY GETS F-MAP
- 23 IT'S GOING TO CREATE SOME KIND OF A ALLOCATION DISPUTE IN
- 24 FUTURE YEARS. BUT THE FACT IS ALL OF THESE ARE ONE-TIME MONEY,
- 25 WHETHER IT'S PRIOR YEAR SALES TAX OR WHETHER IT'S F-MAP,



- 1 THEY'RE ALL ONE-TIME MONEY. SO I THINK IF YOU GIVE US THE
- 2 DIRECTION THAT IT'S CAPPED AT 4.6, THEN WE'LL WORK OUT THE
- 3 BEST WAY TO DO IT, DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

4

5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OR I WOULD ADD THAT TO THE --

6

- 7 SPEAKER: YEAH I WAS GOING TO SAY PUT THAT THRESHOLD IN THERE
- 8 IN ZEV'S MOTION.

9

10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WITH NO COMMITMENT, AT LEAST TO MY --

11

12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: VIOLET GIVE THAT MY MOTION.

13

14 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WELL YOUR MOTION?

15

16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AT LEAST ON MY --.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OR YVONNE CAN ADD THAT TO THE MOTION, JUST
- 19 WORK OFF OF THAT.

20

21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT THAT THE 4%, CAPPED AT 4%.

22

23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO, NO \$4.6 MILLION.



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 4.630 MILLION WITH NO AGREEMENT, I MEAN THEY
- 2 CAN ALWAYS COME BACK BUT I WOULDN'T AT THIS POINT AGREE TO GO
- 3 ABOVE 4.630 AT A LATER DATE.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OH, OKAY IF YOU HAVE THE 4.6 THAT TAKES
- 6 CARE OF IT, RIGHT.

7

8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: 4.63.

9

- 10 SPEAKER: AND ONE OTHER THING THAT JUST WAS BROUGHT UP JUST TO
- 11 CLARIFY, AS I UNDERSTAND THE ALLOCATION AND, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE
- 12 TWO SEPARATE HUGE ISSUES AMONG OUR CONTRACT AGENCIES. ONE OF
- 13 THEM IS THE CURTAILMENT, WHICH WE'RE FACING TO THE EXTENT OF
- 14 \$4.59 MILLION, AND THE OTHER IS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF PRIOR
- 15 YEAR SB-90 CLAIMS. AS I UNDERSTAND THE MOTION, \$2 AND A HALF
- 16 MILLION OF THIS 4.6 IS GOING TO GO TO THE RESTORATION AND THE
- 17 REMAINDER WILL GO TO SB-90 CLAIMS. SO THERE WILL STILL BE
- 18 AGAIN, JUST TO CLARIFY THIS, THIS WILL NOT FULLY RESTORE THE -
- 19 AND I'M NOT COMPLAINING ABOUT IT, WE APPRECIATE THIS, WE
- 20 JUST WANT -- I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT CLEAR.

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU KNOW WHAT I WOULD -- I WANT TO TELL YOU
- 23 WHAT JOHN FERRARO ONCE SAID WHEN HE WAS -- WHEN I SERVED WITH
- 24 HIM AND HE WAS PRESIDENT IN THE COUNCIL. HE SAID 'YOU CAN KEEP



```
TALKING AND RISK LOSING VOTES OR KEEP YOUR MOUTH SHUT AND WALK
1
    AWAY A WINNER.'
2
3
    SPEAKER: MY APOLOGIES.
4
5
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY, WE'RE CAPPING IT AT THE 4.6 -- [
6
7
   MIXED VOICES ]
8
    SPEAKER: I LEARNED A LESSON TODAY, THANK YOU.
10
11
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, IS THERE ANY OBJECTION AS
12
    AMENDED?
13
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AS AMENDED WITH A CAP OF 4.630 MILLION AND
14
    AMENDED WITH MY HAND-WRITTEN MOTION WHICH IS AN AMENDMENT TO
15
16
    THE ANTONOVICH --
17
18
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S DOLLAR FOR DOLLAR IN OTHER WORDS.
19
20
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: DOLLAR FOR DOLLAR WITH A CAP OF 4.63. BUT
    SHE'S GOT -- YOU GOT IT ALL? [ INAUDIBLE ].
21
22
23
    SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY.
24
```



- 1 SUP. KNABE: BASICALLY AND THEN DIRECT MISS SIERRA TO COME BACK
- 2 --.

3

4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE ANY OBJECTION?

5

6 SUP. KNABE: TO COME BACK WITH BEST WAY TO FUND THAT.

7

8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED.

9

10 SPEAKER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, I APPRECIATE YOUR --

11

- 12 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. NOW THAT INCLUDES THE AMENDMENTS
- 13 WE HAVE BEFORE US.

14

- 15 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT SINCE WE FINISHED THAT, AND I DON'T
- 16 WANT TO ADD CONFUSION, I STILL WANT A WRITTEN REPORT FROM MR.
- 17 SOUTHARD AS TO WHAT HAPPENS TO THE F-MAP AND S.A.M.S.A. MONEY
- 18 WHEN THIS OTHER MONEY -- OKAY? THAT'S ALL. I DIDN'T WANT TO
- 19 ADD TO THE CONFUSION.

20

- 21 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY, WELL I -- OKAY, ALL RIGHT. OKAY, THE
- 22 NEXT ITEM FOR US THEN TO CONSIDER IS ITEM 20, 20. INSTRUCT THE
- 23 AUDITOR-CONTROLLER TO PREPARE AND PRESENT THE FINAL BUDGET
- 24 RESOLUTION FOR A BOARD ADOPTION. FIVE MINUTES.



- 1 SUP. KNABE: I HAVE A QUESTION, MR. JANSSEN. AS IT RELATES TO
- 2 THIS PROCESS AT THIS PARTICULAR POINT, CAN YOU NOT SINCE A LOT
- 3 OF, I MEAN WE'VE DONE SOME THINGS TODAY THAT WAS A DIRECTION
- 4 TO BE IMPLEMENTED ON JULY 1ST, AS PART OF THE BUDGET. BUT IN
- 5 LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE STATE HAS NOT ADOPTED THEIR BUDGET
- 6 YET, CAN WE NOT MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS BUDGET WITHOUT ADOPTING
- 7 IT UNTIL SUCH TIME WHEN WE COME BACK, SAY AT THE END OF THE
- 8 SUMMER?

9

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, YOU CAN LEGALLY DO THAT, YOU'RE NOT
- 11 REQUIRED TO ADOPT A BUDGET UNTIL OCTOBER BUT MY RECOMMENDATION
- 12 IS THAT YOU DO ADOPT A BUDGET NOW.

13

- 14 SUP. KNABE: AND SO EVERYTHING -- I MEAN -- AT SOME POINT WE'RE
- 15 GOING TO GET SOMETHING ON THE STATE, HOPEFULLY.

16

17 SPEAKER: YEAH, WE WILL GET SOMETHING.

18

- 19 SUP. KNABE: SO THEN DOES EVERYTHING BECOME A FOUR-VOTE ITEM AT
- 20 PARTICULAR POINT, ANY CHANGES TO THE BUDGET?

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL ANY ADDITIONS TO THE BUDGET WOULD BE FOUR
- 23 VOTE. I THINK IF YOU KEPT THE BUDGET OPEN UNTIL OCTOBER, YOU
- 24 WOULD BE ABLE TO MOVE MONEY AROUND, TO ADD PROGRAMS ON THREE
- 25 VOTES. IF YOU CLOSE THE BUDGET IT TAKES FOUR VOTES. BUT THE



- 1 STATE IS NOT GOING TO BE GIVING US MORE MONEY. WE'RE GOING TO
- 2 BE LOOKING AT WHERE CAN WE CUT THE BUDGET. AND --.

3

- 4 SUP. KNABE: I KNOW, BUT WE ALSO DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY'RE GOING
- 5 TO TAKE IT AWAY. WE KNOW THEY'RE NOT GOING TO GIVE US MORE BUT
- 6 WE DON'T ALSO DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY'RE GOING TO TAKE IT AWAY,
- 7 ALL RIGHT BUT I --

8

9 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT WE HAVE ADOPTED TO FREEZE UNTIL THEN.

10

- 11 SUP. KNABE: NO ONLY UNTIL OCTOBER 1ST, THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING
- 12 IF WE COULD PROCEED ON THAT BASIS WITH ZEV'S MOTION, WELL THEN
- 13 WHY DO WE NEED TO ADOPT THE BUDGET TODAY? SINCE YOU HAVE A
- 14 PRELIMINARY ADOPTION AND YOU'VE HAD THE CHANGES TODAY
- 15 IMPLEMENTING ANY CHANGES ON JULY 1.

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IF YOU DON'T ADOPT THE BUDGET THERE ARE
- 18 TECHNICALLY THINGS THAT CANNOT BE DONE. I MEAN DEPARTMENTS
- 19 CANNOT FILL POSITION -- NEW POSITIONS, CAN'T DO CAPITAL
- 20 PROJECTS, MAINTENANCE, ETCETERA, THERE IS A LOT THAT YOU CAN'T
- 21 DO IF YOU DON'T HAVE A FINAL BUDGET. I BELIEVE THE BOARD HAS
- 22 ALWAYS -- WE ADOPTED THE BUDGET LAST YEAR FOR EXAMPLE, WE
- 23 DIDN'T HAVE A STATE BUDGET UNTIL THE END OF SEPTEMBER BUT WE
- 24 STILL ADOPTED OUR BUDGET. IT DEMONSTRATES IT SEEMS TO ME THAT,
- 25 PEOPLE KNOW THAT WE FOR -- IN DEALING WITH OUR OWN LOCAL



- 1 PROBLEMS WE KNOW WHAT WE'RE DOING AND IT CLARIFIES IN ANY
- 2 ADDITION OR CHANGES TO THE BUDGET ARE BROUGHT ABOUT BY ACTIONS
- 3 OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND NOT BY THIS BOARD.

4

5 SUP. KNABE: ALL RIGHT THANK YOU.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT LET'S GO ON. WE'LL HOLD -- WE'RE
- 8 -- ITEM 21.

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 21 ARE A NUMBER OF TECHNICAL --
- 11 THOUGH I DO WANT TO TALK ABOUT ONE OF THEM. AUTHORIZING THE
- 12 ROUNDING OF THE BUDGET TO NEAREST THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, SO
- 13 AUTHORIZING THE AUDITOR/CONTROLLER TO MAKE APPROPRIATION
- 14 ADJUSTMENTS, AUTHORIZING TRANSFERS WITHIN THE HEALTH
- 15 DEPARTMENT. ITEM NUMBER SEVEN, LET ME JUST MENTION ITEM NUMBER
- 16 SEVEN, WHICH HAS TO DO WITH DISNEY HALL. WE'RE ACTUALLY
- 17 RECOMMENDING THAT YOU AMEND THE OPERATING AGREEMENT. AND THE
- 18 PROBLEM IS THIS. DISNEY HALL IS NOT COMPLETED. AND WE DO NOT
- 19 WANT TO ACCEPT IT UNTIL IT HAS BEEN THOROUGHLY COMPLETED AND
- 20 YET THE OPERATING COMPANY DOES HAVE TO START PROVIDING
- 21 MAINTENANCE AND CUSTODIAL SERVICES AND SECURITY. THIS WILL
- 22 ALLOW US TO MAKE THOSE EXPENDITURES WITHOUT ACCEPTING THE
- 23 BUILDING. THOSE ARE WHAT THESE AMENDMENTS DO, IT'S PRETTY
- 24 STRAIGHTFORWARD, IT'S FOR OUR PROTECTION. SO WE RECOMMEND
- 25 SEVEN -- THE REST OF THEM ARE TECHNICAL.

25

HOSPITAL?

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 2 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. 3 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I WOULD LIKE TO DIVIDE QUESTION -- OR PART 4 5 THREE AND FOUR. 6 7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ON THREE AND FOUR. 8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ON THIS ITEM, 21, INCREASING THE AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT BOARD APPROVAL. 10 11 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OH ITEM FOUR? 13 14 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO THREE AND FOUR. 15 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THREE IS --. 17 18 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: TRANSFER --19 20 SUP. ANTONOVICH: APPROPRIATIONS UP TO 250,000 PER QUARTER AND AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES UP TO \$1 MILLION PER QUARTER. I JUST 21 22 BELIEVE THAT SHOULD COME BEFORE THE BOARD. 23 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THAT BECAUSE WE'RE CONSTRUCTING A 24



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THREE IS EXISTING, WE HAVE AUTHORITY FOR
- 3 \$250,000. ITEM FOUR IS NEW, IT WOULD ALLOW A LARGER SHIFTING
- 4 OF APPROPRIATIONS WITHIN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT. SO THE
- 5 SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH IS CORRECT. IT IS A NEW RECOMMENDATION.

6

7 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THE REASON --

8

9 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I'D JUST LIKE TO DIVIDE THOSE TWO QUESTIONS.

10

11 SUP. KNABE: BUT ITEM THREE'S BEEN -- WE'VE HAD THAT BEFORE.

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S THE SAME AS THIS --

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, OKAY WE'LL DIVIDE THE QUESTION
- 16 ON EVERYTHING -- WE WILL TAKE OUT THREE AND FOUR.

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OR JUST TAKE OUT FOUR, JUST TAKE OUT FOUR I
- 19 THINK, EVERYTHING ELSE IS THE SAME, AND VOTE FOUR SEPARATELY.
- 20 SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT?

21

- 22 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY I WOULDN'T MIND HAVING THREE AS A
- 23 SEPARATE VOTE.



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, ITEM THREE AND FOUR WILL BE
- 2 VOTED ON SEPARATELY. THE -- IS THERE A MOTION?

3

4 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SO MOVED.

5

- 6 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ON 21, ALL RIGHT IS THERE -- IT'S SECONDED
- 7 BY KNABE. ANY OBJECTION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, 21 EXCEPT THREE
- 8 AND FOUR ARE ADOPTED.

9

10 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: I'M SORRY? I DIDN'T GET THE SECOND ON 21.

11

12 SUP. KNABE: I SECONDED.

13

14 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: OKAY.

15

16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ITEM THREE AND FOUR, IS THERE A MOTION?

17

18 SUP. KNABE: I MOVE TO APPROVE ITEM THREE.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED BY KNABE, SECONDED BY YAROSLAVKSY,
- 21 ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY 'AYE.'

22

23 SUP. KNABE: AYE.

24

25 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OPPOSED?



1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO. 2 3 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ITEM FOUR, IS THERE A MOTION? MOVED BY 4 5 YAROSLAVSKY, SECONDED BY KNABE, IS THERE OBJECTION? 6 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YES. 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THERE'S ONE OBJECTION, THE VOTE IS 4-1. 10 11 SUP. ANTONOVICH: IT'S A MILLION DOLLAR APPROVAL WITHOUT BOARD 12 APPROVAL. 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MADAM CHAIR ON ITEM THREE, CAN I -- I THINK 14 I MAY HAVE MISUNDERSTOOD SOMETHING. IS THAT AUTHORIZING THE 15 16 C.A.O. TO APPROVE TRANSFERS WITHIN A BUDGET ABOUT THE 250 THOUSAND PER QUARTER? WHAT IS IT NOW? 17 18 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS LANGUAGE IS NOT DIFFERENT. ITEM FOUR IS 20 DIFFERENT. 21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IF IT'S NOT DIFFERENT, WHY IT IS IN THERE?
- 23 DOES IT HAVE TO BE DONE EVERY YEAR?

24

25 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES IT DOES.



SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, IS THE AUDITOR READY?

- 4 SPEAKER: SUPERVISOR BURKE, AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD I HAVE
- 5 SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO PREPARE THE FINAL BUDGET AS YOU
- 6 DELIBERATED.

3

7

12

14

16

8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT IS THERE A MOTION ON THE FINAL

- 9 BUDGET? MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY, SECONDED BY KNABE, CALL THE
- 10 ROLL. IS SUPERVISOR MOLINA HERE? WELL WE'LL TAKE IT -- IS
- 11 THERE ANY OBJECTION.

13 **SPEAKER:** YES.

15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: OKAY LET'S WAIT FOR HER TO COME BACK.

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND YOU SHOULD BE -- THE COUNTY COUNSEL TELLS

- 18 ME YOU SHOULD DO ITEM 20 AT THE SAME TIME, WHICH IS
- 19 INSTRUCTING THE CONTROLLER TO PREPARE AND PRESENT THE FINAL
- 20 RESOLUTION, JUST TO BE TECHNICALLY ACCURATE.
- 22 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT, SO MOTION IS ON 20 AND 22.
- 24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

25

21



- 1 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE MOTION IS 20 AND 22. WELL, LET'S --
- 2 OKAY. WHILE SHE'S COMING, LET ME JUST SEE, OF THE PEOPLE WHO
- 3 HAD ASKED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, HOW MANY ARE HERE. ARE THE
- 4 PEOPLE WHO WERE HERE ON CASTAIC LAKE --

5

6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: CASTAIC.

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: CASTAIC, CASTAIC. LLOYD CARDOR, STAN
- 9 VANDERBURG, DAVID JARRELL, SAL VALLONE, DEREK ELLERI, SCOTT
- 10 FRAYER, ANN AMMONS, CHRISTINE BROWN. ARE ANY OF THEM HERE? ALL
- 11 RIGHT IS MARSHA MCLEAN STILL HERE?

12

13 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE COUNCIL WOMAN, SHE'S LEFT.

14

- 15 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE COUNCIL WOMAN, MARSHA MCLEAN HAS GONE?
- 16 AND ROBERT DONIN, ARE YOU STILL HERE? ALL RIGHT. WE'LL CALL
- 17 YOU IN ONE MINUTE. WHY DON'T YOU START COMING UP. ACCESS TO
- 18 SPECIALTY CARE. IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION, WE'LL TAKE PUBLIC
- 19 COMMENT OUT OF ORDER. YES PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME.

- 21 ROBERT DONIN: GOOD AFTERNOON, MADAM CHAIR. MY NAME IS ROBERT
- 22 DONIN. I AM HERE TODAY REPRESENTING THE CALIFORNIA ACCESS TO
- 23 SPECIALTY CARE COALITION, AND ON BEHALF OF OUR CHAIR, DR.
- 24 JUDITH BOSTON AND OUR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DIANNE PRESSURE
- 25 PORESKI, AND THE MEMBERSHIP OF OUR COALITION WE THANK YOU FOR



- 1 THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HERE TO COMMUNICATE WITH YOU ON THE
- 2 SUBJECT. THE CALIFORNIA ACCESS TO SPECIALTY CARE COALITION
- 3 REPRESENTS CONSUMERS AND MEDICAL SPECIALTIES CONCERNED WITH
- 4 PATIENTS' ACCESS TO SPECIALTY CARE. WE RECOGNIZE THAT LOS
- 5 ANGELES COUNTY HAS LIMITED HEALTH CARE RESOURCES THAT MAKES IT
- 6 EVEN MORE IMPORTANT THAT THE HEALTHCARE DELIVERY SYSTEM FOCUS
- 7 ON MAINTAINING ACCESS TO AT LEAST BASIC HEALTHCARE SERVICES
- 8 SYSTEM-WIDE. BY CLOSING ENTIRE FACILITIES, IT SERIOUSLY
- 9 AFFECTS PATIENTS' ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES. RATHER THAN
- 10 CLOSING THE ENTIRE FACILITY, WE BELIEVE THAT SERVICES SHOULD
- 11 BE SCALED BACK IN ALL CENTERS, RETAINING AT LEAST BASIC
- 12 HEALTHCARE SERVICES IN EACH FACILITY. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS
- 13 WOULD BE THE BEST USE OF LIMITED RESOURCES. THANK YOU VERY
- 14 MUCH FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE'LL RECESS FOR TWO
- 17 MINUTES. [BRIEF RECESS]

18

- 19 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THERE'S A MOTION BEFORE US TO
- 20 APPROVE THE BUDGET. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL?

21

- 22 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS ON ITEMS 20 AND 22.
- 23 SUPERVISOR MOLINA?

24

25 SUP. MOLINA: AYE.



1 2 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY. 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AYE. 4 5 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR KNABE. 6 7 8 SUP. KNABE: AYE. 9 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH. 10 11 12 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO. 13 14 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: AND SUPERVISOR BURKE. 15 16 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AYE. 17 18 CLERK VARONA-LUKENS: THE MOTION CARRIES, WITH SUPERVISOR 19 ANTONOVICH VOTING "NO." 20 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I THINK HE GOT MORE MONEY IN THE BUDGET 21 22 THAN ANYONE ELSE. HIS MOTIONS MORE -- HE PUT MORE IN. 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: DO YOU WANT TO RECONSIDER IT? 24 25



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT STILL HAS A SHORTAGE
- 2 OF PERSONNEL, WHICH IS, FOR SAFE COMMUNITIES --

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL I'M SAYING IS IT'S YOUR BUDGET. YOU
- 5 HAVE MORE IN HERE THAN ANYONE ELSE.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: LET'S TAKE THE CASTAIC MONEY AND GIVE IT TO
- 8 THE SHERIFF.

9

- 10 SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YEAH, MAYBE WE BETTER SEND THE CASTAIC
- 11 MONEY TO THE SHERIFF.

12

- 13 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I THOUGHT MENTAL HEALTH SERVED EVERY
- 14 CONSTITUENCY AS THE LIBRARIES, I THOUGHT LIBRARIES WERE
- 15 SERVING ALL CONSTITUENCIES.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: LET'S MOVE THAT HALF A MILLION FOR CASTAIC
- 18 INTO THE SHERIFF.

19

- 20 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AND I'M HOPING THAT THE SHERIFF WOULD BE
- 21 SERVING ALL CONSTITUENCIES AS WELL.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WE COULD BUY TWO DEPUTY SHERIFFS FOR A HALF
- 24 A MILLION DOLLARS. OR IS IT FOUR NOW?